



RESTORATION QUARTERLY

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP

Vol. 2, No. 1
1st Quarter, 1958

EDITOR

J. W. Roberts, Abilene Christian College
Box 173, Station ACC; Abilene, Texas

EDITORIAL BOARD

Batsell Barrett Baxter, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee
William M. Green, University of California, Berkeley 4, California
Reuel Lemmons, Editor *Firm Foundation*, Box 77, Austin, Texas
Joe Sanders, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee
J. D. Thomas, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
Jack P. Lewis, Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas

BUSINESS MANAGER: Pat Harrell, P. O. Box 45,
Natick, Massachusetts

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Abe Malherbe, Box 144,
Lexington, Massachusetts

Contributions are invited. Manuscripts and communications for the *Quarterly* should be addressed to the editor. MSS should be type-written, double-spaced, and proof-read before submitted. Notes and appropriate references may either be at the end of the articles or at the bottom of pages. Hebrew and Greek words should be transliterated. A biographical sketch should accompany each new contributor's work. No manuscripts will be returned, except when accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Books for review should be sent to *Restoration Quarterly*, P. O. Box 45, Natick, Massachusetts.

Subscriptions and business correspondence should be sent to the Business Manager, P. O. Box 45, Natick, Massachusetts.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Regular
One Year \$3.00

Single Copies \$1.00

Students
One Year \$2.00

CONTENTS

The J. W. McGarvey Award	2
A Critical Analysis of the Mystery Revealed to Paul —Frank Van Duke	3
List of Theses at Harding College	11
The Lunenburg Letter—Glenn Paden	13
A Note on the Preposition <i>eis</i> in Matthew 12:41—J. W. Roberts....	19
Personalia	21
The Faith and Contemporary Theology—J. D. Thomas	22
Blessing in the Old Testament, A Study of Gen. 12:3 —Paul Rotenberry	32
The Problem of Man's Salvation—Bob R. Winter	37
A Note on 1 Cor. 12:13—J. W. McGarvey	45

BOOK NOTICES

Louis Berkhof: <i>Principles of Biblical Interpretation</i>	48
Archibald McLean: <i>Alexander Campbell as a Preacher</i>	48
J. B. Lightfoot: <i>The Apostolic Fathers</i>	48
Pat Harrell.	

Announcing

The J. W. McGARVEY AWARD
\$100.00 Contest For 1958

conducted by the

RESTORATION QUARTERLY

To encourage Christian Scholarship the publishers of the Restoration Quarterly offer \$100.00—to be known as the J. W. McGarvey Award—for the most distinctive article on a Biblical or Biblical related subject appearing in the Quarterly during 1958. There are no restrictions as to subject, length, author, or number of entries.

The award can be divided at the discretion of the judges and their decision will be final. The winner will be announced in the first issue of 1959 (Vol. 3 No. 1).

Send typewritten, double-spaced manuscripts along with a short biographical statement to the Editor.

Dr. J. W. Roberts, Editor

Box 173, Station ACC

Abilene, Texas

A Critical Analysis of the Mystery Revealed to Paul

Frank Van Dyke

Paul calls the gospel (or a special part of it) the mystery that was made known to him.¹ A certain Dispensational theory says that this was a new gospel revealed to Paul; that Paul's gospel was different from that preached by the twelve apostles; that a new dispensation (called the mystery dispensation) began with Paul.

There are two forms of Dispensationalism. The more popular form (the Darby-Scofield type) is commonly known as Premillennialism. The more extreme form (Bullingerism), in addition to holding the premillennial view, claims that an entirely new gospel was revealed to Paul, and that water baptism is no part of it for any purpose. The regular form (Premillennialism) has been given considerable attention; but this more extreme form of Dispensationalism needs more thorough investigation than it has heretofore received.

I. Nature and History of Dispensationalism

Dispensationalism defined. The word *dispensation* is translated from the Greek word *oikonomia*, which means "*the management, oversight, administration, of others' property; the office of a manager or overseer, stewardship.*"² The idea of a period of time does not inhere in this word; however, E. W. Bullinger, a staunch Dispensationalist, correctly states:

The Greek word rendered Dispensation is *oiknomia*, and refers to *the act of administering*. By the figure *Metonymy*, the *act of administering* is transferred to *the time during which that administering is carried on*.³

C. I. Scofield, the man who popularized Dispensationalism in America, gave this definition: "A dispensation is a period of time during which man is tested in respect to obedience to some *specific* revelation of the will of God."⁴

Strictly speaking, anybody who understands the distinction between the Law of Moses and the Gospel of Christ may be called a dispensationalist. But the word Dispensationalism, as it is used today to designate a certain system of teaching, means much more than this. It includes the special idea that the Church Age is not only distinct from the Jewish Age, but that it is a dispensation that was never foretold in prophecy.

History of Dispensationalism. Dispensationalism, as a historical movement, can be traced back to the Plymouth Brethren in England

¹Ephesians 3:1-7.

²Joseph Henry Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, p. 440.

³Ethelbert W. Bullinger, *How to Enjoy the Bible*, p. 79.

⁴Cyrus Ingersol Scofield (ed.), *The Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 5.

and Ireland, early in the nineteenth century. John Nelson Darby, originator and leader of this group, traveled extensively in the United States and Canada. Two men in America who became fervent advocates of Darby's teaching were James H. Brookes, of St. Louis, and James Inglis, of New York.

W. E. Blackstone and C. I. Scofield popularized Dispensationalism in America. Arno C. Gaebelein, a close friend of Scofield and a member of the committee that produced the *Scofield Reference Bible*, gives us the information that Scofield was closely associated with, and received the principles of Dispensational interpretation from, James H. Brookes.⁵

The Darby-Scofield type of Dispensationalism may be summarized as follows: (1) The prophecies of the Old Testament foretold an earthly kingdom for Israel; (2) Christ came to set up this earthly kingdom; (3) if the Jews had accepted Christ, the kingdom would have been established; but when they rejected him, the fulfillment of prophecy was interrupted, and the Church was established; (4) the Church will be raptured to glory before the Great Tribulation, and then following the Great Tribulation Christ will establish an earthly kingdom and reign as an earthly king for one thousand years; (5) though there were some transitional changes during the Acts period, the Church began at Pentecost, and the Twelve preached the mystery gospel of grace.

Ultra Dispensationalism. E. W. Bullinger, in England (1837-1913), went beyond Darbyism and taught that the present Church Age did not start until after the close of Acts, and that water baptism is no part of the gospel for this age. His teaching is denounced by many other Dispensationalists as "Ultra Dispensationalism."

Some present day Dispensationalists, such as J. C. O'Hair, of Chicago, and C. R. Stam and Charles F. Baker, of Milwaukee, disagree with both Darbyism and Bullingerism on the beginning of the Church. They claim that the Church started after Pentecost but before the close of Acts; but they do not agree on an exact time for its beginning. John B. Graber, a Dispensationalist of the Darby-Scofield kind, classes the teaching of these men as Ultra Dispensationalism, but he calls it the "moderate type" and Bullinger's views, the "extreme type."⁶

Both the "moderate type" and the "extreme type" of Ultra Dispensationalists insist that the present dispensation of grace began with Paul, not Pentecost, and that water baptism is not to be practiced today.

II. The Mystery Revealed to Paul

What is the mystery? The word *mystery* (*musterion*) means, ac-

⁵Arno C. Gaebelein, "The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible," *Moody Monthly*, XLIII (November, 1942), 128, 129.

⁶John B. Graber, "Ultra-dispensationalism" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1949), p. 43.

cording to Thayer, "*hidden purpose or counsel; secret will.*"⁷ It is something once hidden and then revealed. Paul defines it as the great truth that "Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel."⁸

Dispensational claims about its beginning. Dispensationalists insist strongly that the prophetic message of the Old Testament had no reference to the present Church age. Cornelius R. Stam states that the prophetic message "*deals directly with Israel and the nations, not with the body of Christ.*"⁹

Furthermore, it is claimed that the Twelve never did preach the mystery gospel, the gospel of the grace of God. Stam says that "it was through Paul, and no one before Paul, that Christ was *set forth to be a propitiation* THROUGH FAITH IN HIS BLOOD (Rom. 3: 25)."¹⁰

Ephesians 3:1-12. This is one of the main passages of Scripture used in support of this Dispensational teaching. The main points used are listed below.

1. A dispensation or stewardship (*oiknomia*) was given to Paul. (v. 2). It is claimed that this was a special stewardship that was committed to Paul exclusively, or at least was revealed to him first. It is a mere assumption, however, to say that this had never been revealed before. Paul says in verse 5 that this same thing had been revealed to the other apostles and prophets.

2. The *mystery* was made known to Paul. (v. 3). Again it is assumed that this mystery remained hidden until it was revealed to Paul; however, this the passage does not so state. To say that God revealed a thing to Paul is not to say that he revealed it first or exclusively to Paul. Dispensationalists make a serious error in logic, and consequently in their exegesis, at this point.

3. The mystery "in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets." (v. 5). This is taken to mean that no reference to the mystery was made in prophecy; because, it is said, if the Old Testament prophets foretold the great mystery, then it was made known in the sense that Paul says it had not been made known. Peter plainly states, however, that the prophets "prophesied of the grace that should come unto you" and that they "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ."¹¹ Obviously, this is grace on the basis of Christ's sufferings (or the shedding of his blood). The prophets, according to Peter, foretold it! And Peter and others (before Paul) preached this redemption on the basis of "the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot."¹² Still, Stam declares that "in

⁷Thayer, *op. cit.*, p. 420.

⁸Ephesians 3:6.

⁹Cornelius R. Stam, *The Fundamentals of Dispensationalism*, p. 55.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹¹I Peter 1:10-12.

¹²I Peter 1:19.

prophecy salvation by grace through faith *alone* is not contemplated,"¹³ and that "*never were the merits of Christ's death proclaimed as the ground of Salvation until Paul.*"¹⁴

Peter's implication, in the passages cited above, plainly is that what the prophets had prophesied about was now being more fully made known. It had been referred to by the prophets, but it had not been made known as it was now being made known. This also is the meaning of Ephesians 3:5.

4. Paul says that "unto me . . . is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." (v. 8). Here again it is assumed that this grace was given to Paul exclusively; but the verse does not state this. What had been committed to the Twelve was now given to Paul that he might go especially to the Gentiles with it.

5. The word *unsearchable* (*anexichniastros*) is said to mean that the gospel had never been mentioned in prophecy. O'Hair affirms: "The word '*unsearchable*' means '*untraceable*'; this is, '*unprophe- sied*'."¹⁵

Thayer defines *anexichniastros* this way: "*that cannot be traced out, that cannot be comprehended, . . .*"¹⁶ The riches of Christ, even after God has told man about them in the gospel, are still to an extent unsearchable; man is not fully capable of tracing them out, or understanding them. And certainly he did not trace them out in the sense of discovering them for himself. The reference is to man's comprehension, not to what the prophets had said, or had not said, about these matters.

6. Paul speaks of the "mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God." (v. 9). Dispensationalists take this to mean that it was completely hidden until it was revealed to Paul. This, however, is a strained and unnecessary construction of Paul's language. Before the mystery was revealed to the holy apostles and prophets (as stated in verse 5), not before it was made known to Paul, it was hidden in the mind of God.

Miscellaneous arguments. There are at least three positions held by Dispensationalists on the commission of Matthew 28: (1) Bullinger taught that this commission is for a future age.¹⁷ (2) Stam and others hold that it was the commission for the Twelve in the early Acts period, but not for the present dispensation of grace.¹⁸ (3) Scofield claimed that this commission is for the present age, since this age began at Pentecost.¹⁹

Stam's claim makes the message of this commission a promise of an earthly kingdom, not the offer of grace on the basis of Christ's

¹³Stam, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹⁵J. C. O'Hair, *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ*, p. 113.

¹⁶Thayer, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

¹⁷Bullinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 131, 132.

¹⁸Stam, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-189.

¹⁹Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 1044.

death. He says of it: "This new commission was in fact no departure from the prophetic program; it was a *further development* of it."²⁰ Again he says: "To assume that our Lord now sends these apostles to proclaim '*the gospel of the grace of God*' is wholly unwarranted."²¹

According to Luke 24:46, 47 it was necessary for "Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day" so that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." This is the gospel of remission of sins on the basis of Christ's death; and Stam agrees that this commission, along with the records in Matthew 28:19, 20 and Mark 16:15, 16, is the one proclaimed by the Twelve.²² So when the Twelve, in the early part of Acts, were working under the commission recorded in the gospels, they were proclaiming salvation on the merits of Christ's death.

It is argued, too, that Peter, in Acts 3:19, 20, promised the Jews that God would send Christ back to earth immediately and set up the earthly kingdom, on the condition of their national repentance. There is some contingent relationship expressed in Acts 3:19, 20 between repentance and conversion on the one hand and the coming of Christ on the other. Whatever this relationship may be, there are two things that the passage does not state. It does not say that Christ would have returned immediately if they had repented, nor does it state that he would have come to establish an earthly kingdom. These two ideas are read into the passage.

In Galatians 2:7 Paul says that "the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the *gospel* of the circumcision *was* to Peter." It is assumed that two different gospels are mentioned here, but such an idea is not demanded by the language. One gospel may be under consideration, with two spheres of labor in view for proclaiming the one gospel. The facts demand this idea; for obviously the leaders in Jerusalem gave Paul the right hand of fellowship because they recognized that there was no basic difference between his gospel and theirs.

Ultra Dispensationalists insist that if the Twelve preached the gospel for this age, then the miraculous signs of Mark 16:16-20 must be a part of that gospel now. The mistake here is in assuming that the signs must continue as long as the belief and baptism. Mark 16:16-20 does not itself teach that the signs would be temporary, but it allows for such if it is taught elsewhere in the New Testament. Paul taught in I Corinthians 13:8-10 that miraculous signs would end.

III. Water Baptism and Paul's Gospel

Ultra Dispensationalists teach that water baptism was a part of the "kingdom gospel" of the early Acts period, but it ended when the present dispensation of grace began with Paul's ministry. O'-

²⁰Stam, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

²¹*Ibid.*

²²*Ibid.*, pp. 175, 176.

Hair puts it this way: "Members of Christ's body today are united to the Head in the heavenlies, baptized with His baptism and are complete in Him, and have nothing to do with water baptism."²³

Dispensational interpretations. Dispensationalists deny that water baptism is mentioned in Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:3, 4; Ephesians 4:5; and Colossians 2:12. A distinction is made between "real baptism" (Spirit baptism) and "ritual baptism" (water baptism). Spirit baptism, it is said, is the baptism in these passages; for to allow reference to water baptism is to make water baptism essential, and that just cannot be true!

The idea of Spirit baptism, as the Dispensationalists speak of it, is unusual. Chafer says that *baptidzo* has a "secondary meaning" of being "joined closely to that which exercises a determining influence."²⁴ Baker states that "the word BAPTISM has a basic meaning to *become identified with*."²⁵ Chafer speaks again of the "Spirit's ministry of uniting the believer to Christ," and says that this is the baptism into Christ.²⁶ To be baptized by the Spirit, according to this, is to be brought by the Spirit into close union with Christ.

There are serious objections to these interpretations. The term "ritual baptism" is prejudicial. Water baptism is not "ritual" in the sense of the meritorious factor. Furthermore, it is begging the question to eliminate water baptism from these passages merely because to allow it is to make water baptism necessary.

The results are confused with the element in their idea of Spirit Baptism. They make the Spirit the agent, and Christ the element in which the believer is baptized. Even if Spirit baptism did put one into Christ, the Spirit would be the element, and being put into Christ would be the result. John said: "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance."²⁷ Water was the element in which they were baptized; the result, a life of repentance. Likewise, in being baptized into Christ, one is baptized in water (the element), and being in Christ is the end reached. Being in Christ is not the baptism. It would be interesting to have Chafer's and Baker's authority for their definitions of *baptidzo*. Thayer, Abbott-Smith, and Liddell and Scott do not give such a definition.

Much is made of the fact that Paul does not command baptism in the epistles. This is taken to mean that water baptism had ended. The epistles were written to Christians, so the natural thing would be for Paul to speak of what baptism had done for them, instead of commanding it.

The one baptism of Ephesians 4:5. This is water baptism. The baptism of Matthew 28:19, 20 is to be administered by man, and it is therefore water baptism. Man does not administer Spirit baptism.

²³O'Hair, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

²⁴Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, III, 73.

²⁵Charles F. Baker, *Real Baptism*, p. 64.

²⁶Chafer, *loc. cit.*

²⁷Matthew 3:11.

This commission was given in Galilee. The gospel that began in Galilee was preached by Peter to Cornelius, according to Acts 10:37. And this was the gospel by which a people are called from among the Gentiles, according to Acts 15:14, which is admittedly the work of Paul's gospel in this age. So the gospel that Peter preached to Cornelius is the gospel of Matthew 28:19, 20, and it is the gospel for this age. That gospel requires water baptism, so water baptism must be the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5.

IV. Objections to Dispensational Views of the Mystery

Prophecies applied to the church. The prophecies of the Old Testament do not leap over the present age of grace. A detailed exegesis cannot be given here, but prophecies are applied to the present age in Acts 13:32-37; 15:15, 16; 26:22, 23; Hebrews 8:8-12; and many other passages.

The Twelve preached the gospel of grace. It has already been shown that the commission of Matthew 28:19, 20, under which the apostles labored, is the gospel of grace for this age. In I Peter 1:18, 19 Peter says that he preached that men are now redeemed "with the precious blood of Christ." The gospel in Hebrews, according to Hebrews 2:3, was "confirmed unto us by them that heard him" (by the Twelve). This gospel offers redemption on the basis of Christ's blood.

Paul preached the same gospel that the Twelve preached. In Galatians 1:23 Paul says that after his conversion he preached "the faith which once he destroyed," but he had previously destroyed the gospel preached by the Twelve. Again, Paul continued to preach *this same* gospel until he was before Agrippa in Acts 26:22. For this preaching he was imprisoned but in Ephesians 6:20 he says that for the Mystery gospel he was "an ambassador in bonds." Paul had always taught the same gospel set forth in Ephesians, and this was the gospel that he once opposed (the gospel of the Twelve).

The Joint-Body Church which Paul preached began at Pentecost. According to Ephesians 1:20, 23, Christ was made head of the church, the body, when God "set *him* at his own right hand in the heavenly places." This Church, begun when God set Christ at his right hand, is the same as the Joint-Body of Ephesians 2:15, 16 (the so-called Mystery Church).

In Acts 28:30, 31, after Paul went to Rome, he was "preaching the Kingdom of God." It is agreed that he was not offering an earthly kingdom. If Paul preached the kingdom, but not an earthly kingdom, why conclude that the Twelve were preaching an earthly kingdom when they preached the kingdom of God.

Misunderstanding of Holy Spirit baptism. It has already been seen that Dispensationalists do not think of Holy Spirit baptism as an overwhelming in the Spirit as the element. What they call Holy Spirit baptism is not Holy Spirit baptism at all. Holy Spirit baptism in the New Testament was an experience of being overwhelmed by (or in) the Spirit, and being influenced thereby in a miraculous

way. (See Acts 2 and Acts 10.) If Holy Spirit baptism is the one baptism for this age, then the Holiness cults are right in their claims of being able to perform miraculous signs. The Dispensationalists, however, think these people are wrong about such miracles.

V. Conclusions

Our conclusions are: (1) the Church was not unknown to the prophetic message; (2) applying prophecy to the Church was the method of interpretation used by the apostles; (3) the Twelve preached the gospel of grace before Paul did; (4) Paul preached the same gospel that the Twelve preached, and water baptism is a part of it; (5) the present dispensation of grace began at Pentecost, not with Paul.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, Charles F. *Real Baptism*. Milwaukee: Charles F. Baker, n.d.
- Bullinger, Ethelbert W. *How to Enjoy the Bible*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, Ltd., 1907.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Systematic Theology*. 8 vols. Fourth printing. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1953.
- Gaebelein, Arno C. "The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible," *Moody Monthly*, XLIII (October, 1942), pp. 65, 66, 77; XLIII (November, 1942), pp. 128, 129, 135; XLIII (December, 1942), pp. 202, 203, 233; XLIII (January, 1943), pp. 277, 278, 279; XLIII (February, 1943), pp. 343, 344, 345; XLIII (March, 1943), pp. 400, 401, 419.
- Graber, John B. "Ultra-dispensationalism." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas, 1945.
- O'Hair, J. C. *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ*. Chicago: J. C. O'Hair, 1941.
- Scofield, Cyrus Ingersol (editor). *The Scofield Reference Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Stam, Cornelius R. *The Fundamentals of Dispensationalism*. Milwaukee: The Berean Searchlight, 1951.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. The work of C. L. Wilibald Grimm revised and enlarged. Corrected edition. New York: The American Book Company, 1889.

A LIST OF RECENT MASTER'S THESES IN BIBLE AND BIBLE RELATED STUDIES AT HARDING COLLEGE

Through the kindness of Dr. W. B. West, Jr., head of the Bible Department at Harding College, the following list of Master's Theses completed at the Graduate School there is furnished. These studies are all unpublished theses available in the library at Harding. It is hoped that other lists similar to this may be published in the future, looking toward a complete list of all theses and dissertations written by our people.

MASTER'S THESES

Abney, Robert Alan	The Authorship of the Book of Revelation
Baker, William H.	The Kingdom of God in Matthew
Barclay, Lawrence	An Exegesis of the Sixth Chapter of Paul's
Edwin	Letter to the Saints at Rome
Betts, Joe	Exegesis of Isaiah Fifty-Three
Bever, Ronald	Exegesis of Isaiah Six
Boyd, H. Glenn	A Historical and Biblical Study of the Music
	of the Early Church
Boyd, Reece Vernon	An Exegesis of Jesus' Discourse with and to
	Nicodemus
Breechen, Carl	When Young Christians Marry
Bryant, Rees	The Zealots
Buckley, Dale	An Exegesis of Galatians One with a Critical
	Introduction
Cannon, Joseph L.	A Commentary on the Letter to Titus with a
	Critical Introduction
Cantrell, Paul E.	The Resurrection of Jesus in the Four Gospels
Casella, Carmelo	Christ's Message to the Church at Ephesus
Claasen, Alexander J.	The Lord's Supper in the New Testament
Danley, Claude	Interpretations of the "Rock" of Matthew 16:
	18 During the First Six Centuries
Edwards, Walter B.	Christ's Message to the Church at Pergamum
Floyd, Harvey	Justification by Faith The Example of Abra-
	ham
Fulks, Billy M.	I Corinthians 13
Gregg, George W.	A History of the Church in Antioch of Syria,
	From Its Beginning to the Council of Nicea
Gurganus, George P.	Christian Camping
Hare, Robert Lee	Missionary Work by Churches of Christ in
	Germany, 1946-1955
Hartman, Clyde	Building a Program For the High School Age
	in the Local Church
Hodge, Charles	The Eldership
Holland, Ben Joseph	A Critique of the Religious Philosophy of
	Samuel Butler in His Erewhon and Ere-
	whon Revisited
Holland, Harold	
Edward	The Speeches of Righteous Job
Johnson, Joe Ronald	Worship in the Church at Corinth
Kearly, Furman	An Investigation Into Fulfilled Prophecies
	Concerning Gentile Nations as an Evidence
	of Inspiration

- Kee, Windle
Kendrick, W. Gerald
Knobel, Edgar E.
- Lowder, Arnott Gene
Magee, Paul Ross
Marsh, Douglas S.
- Massey, Jimmy
McGaughey, Don H.
- McRay, John Robert
- Medlin, Morgan R.
Morrow, O. D.
Moore, Wendel Lavern
- Noonan, Jimmy
Olbricht, Glenn Calvin
Ouzts, Eugene
- Page, Robert Raymond
Parker, James
Patterson, Harold
Gene
- Phillips, Billy L.
Pipkin, Henry E.
Pittman, Charles
Porter, Jerry Dean
Prince, Robert B.
- Reed, Ronald
Roe, Robert J.
- Rogers, George L.
Rogers, Oliver Elmo
Rowland, Robert H.
- Sanderson, Leon
Skelton, Robert E.
Stotts, Edwin Keith
- Thompson, Shirley
Jason
Thrasher, Byron J.
- Woods, Paul A.
Wright, V. Ponder
- Nomos as Used in Romans
The Role of Worship in the Church School
A History of Biblical Criticism and Theology
in Germany from Martin Luther to the
Present Day
An Introduction to the Roman Epistle
A Study of Genesis Three
The Book of Revelation in the Life and
Thought of Alexander Campbell Before 1850
Pisteuo in the Epistle to the Romans
The Speeches of Elihu; A Study of Job Chap-
ters 32-37
The Fact and Nature of Eternal Punishment
in the New Testament
Christ's Message to the Church at Thyatira
An Exposition of Romans Seven
An Orientation to the Study of the Prophetical
Writings
The New Testament Doctrine of Love
Curriculum for Christian Camps
Ist Thessalonians 4:13-5:11
The Church at Laodicea
An Exegesis of Ist Corinthians 15:29-49
The Biblical Doctrine of Election with Special
Attention to Romans 8, 9-11
Selected Studies in the Prophecies of Micah
The New Covenant as Seen by Jeremiah
The Messianic Character of Psalm 110
The Beatitudes
The Revelation of God in Christ in the Gospel
of John
An Exegesis of Revelation 20:1-10
An Introduction and Problem Study of the
Book of Jude
The Epistle to Philemon
Christ's Message to the Church at Smyrna
The Use of Motion Pictures in Christian Edu-
cation
An Exegesis of Acts Two
The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles
Sin Offering in the Old Testament as the
Background to the Doctrine of the Atone-
ment in the New Testament
The Doctrine of Apostasy in the Hebrew
Epistle
A History of the Instrumental Music Contro-
versy During the 19th Century Restoration
Movement
The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Mary in the
Light of the New Testament
The New Testament Teaching on Divorce

The Lunenburg Letter

An Incident in the History of the Interpretation of Baptism

Glenn Paden

(Editor's note: It was the work of the reformer Alexander Campbell which gave widespread acceptance to the position that New Testament baptism is adult baptism of a penitent believer for the remission of sins. The Campbells at first did not envision a new religious fellowship as a result of their work. They were forced to become an independent group when their plea for a united church upon the pattern of New Testament teaching was rejected. In time they came to believe that the willful adherence to denominational organizations and human creeds in the face of a plea for a return to the simple New Testament church constituted grounds for regarding these denominations as sects and as being in rebellion against God's way. They began with the idea of Christians in all churches but came to see that many rejected the plain teaching of the Bible as to what constituted a Christian. The discussion of "Christians in the sects" was an important discussion in the history of the Restoration movement. The Lunenburg Letter helps us to understand what the young-campbell believed about this question.)

It is not the purpose of this writer to give any ideas or opinions of his own about "Christians among the sects." It is his purpose to show Campbell's true attitude along this line. Campbell's feelings and attitudes do not necessarily correspond with the teachings found in the New Testament. If he was too liberal, he was simply wrong in that phase of the truth; we recognize no man as perfect, save Jesus Christ our Lord.

"The Lunenburg Letter" is a query that came to Alexander Campbell from a lady who lived in Lunenburg, Virginia. She had already read over half of the June 1837 issue of the *Millennial Harbinger* when she came upon these words in an article headed "Letters to England":

We would, indeed, have no objections to cooperate in these matters with *all Christians*, and raise contributions for all such purposes as, in our judgment, are promotive of the Divine glory or of human happiness, whether or not they belong to our churches: *for we find in all Protestant parties Christians* as exemplary as ourselves according to their and our knowledge and opportunities.¹

After reading the above, the lady from Lunenburg wrote to Alexander Campbell the following letter:

Dear brother Campbell—I was much surprised today, while reading the Harbinger, to see that you recognize the Protestant parties as Christian. You say, you find in all Protestant parties Christians.

Dear brother, my surprise and ardent desire to do what is right, prompt me to write to you at this time. I feel well assured, from the estimate you place on the female character,

¹Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. VIII (1837), p. 272.

that you will attend to my feeble questions in search of knowledge.

Will you be so good as to let me know how any one becomes a Christian? What act of yours gave you the name of Christian? At what time had Paul the name of Christ called on him? At what time did Cornelius have Christ named on him? Is it not through this name we obtain eternal life? Does the name of Christ or Christian belong to any but those who believe the gospel, repent, and are buried by baptism into the death of Christ?²

Campbell did not endeavor to answer the questions one by one, but he did get to the main point that she had in mind. He reasoned that this was what she was wanting to know.

In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans; and therefore no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and *the gates of hell have prevailed against his church!* This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects.³

One of the main problems to come up after such a statement would be "Who is a Christian?" Campbell answers with the following words:

But who is a Christian? I answer, every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things *according to his measure of knowledge* of his will. A perfect man in Christ, or a perfect Christian, is one thing; and "a babe in Christ," a stripling in the faith, or an imperfect Christian, is another. The New Testament recognizes both the perfect man and the imperfect man in Christ . . . There is no occasion, then, for making immersion, on a profession of the faith, absolutely essential to a Christian—though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort.⁴

Hence, Campbell's answer is that one who has not been baptized for the remission of sins may be a Christian, though an imperfect one. His premise is that a person is only accountable as far as his knowledge goes.

It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known.⁵

Ignorance is always a crime when it is voluntary; and innocent when it is involuntary.⁶

Campbell then speaks obscurely about an "inward" and an "outward" baptism and thinks that one might have the inward baptism without the outward baptism and be a Christian of the imperfect

²Campbell, *The Lunenburg Letter with Attendant Comments*, p. 2.

³Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. VIII, p. 411.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 411, 414.

⁵Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. VIII, p. 412.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 413.

type, provided, of course, that this person was one who did not willfully neglect the outward baptism.

Can a person who simply, not perversely, mistakes the outward baptism, have the inward? We all agree that he who willfully or negligently perverts the outward, cannot have the inward. But can he who, through a simple mistake, involving no perversity of mind, has misapprehended the outward baptism, yet submitting to it according to his view of it, have the inward baptism which changes his state and has praise of God, though not of all men? is the precise question. To which I answer, that, in my opinion, it is possible.⁷

Before attempting to interpret these statements it will be well to see if Campbell actually taught that baptism was for the remission of sins. Some would try to deny that the mature Campbell really taught that baptism was essential to salvation and that he felt that the "Christians" of all churches were real Christians. A recent book says of this matter: "Alexander Campbell, however, in his reply to the Lunenburg letter, insisted that the unimmersed were Christians."⁸ But on the question of baptism's being a Biblical prerequisite to becoming a Christian or being saved, Campbell's writing is decisive.

It is best to fix the minds of the biblical students upon a very important fact; viz., that immersion is the converting act; or, that *no person is disciplined to Christ until he is immersed.*⁹

To be saved is to be pardoned, to be brought under the sceptre of Jesus. Hence all who believed and were baptized were said to be saved, because *Christ had declared they should be saved.*¹⁰

The Bible says, "*He that believeth and is immersed shall be saved.*" How few believe it! The Bible says, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." How few believe it! The Bible says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."¹¹

The question is, at what instant of time do we enter this kingdom, or come under this reign of God, and by what means? I say, the moment we vow allegiance to the king in the constituted way—the moment we are naturalized—the *moment we are born of water and the Spirit*—the moment we put on Christ—the instant we are converted, and not before.¹²

A gospel without remission of sins is a misnomer; and no person, in those undegenerate days, could preach remission without naming water. . . I am for principles of action. Therefore *I proclaim faith, reformation, immersion, adoption, and eternal life.*¹³

The gospel has in it a command, and as such must be obeyed. On this side, and on that, mankind are in quite different states. On the one side they are pardoned, justified, sanctified, recon-

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 507.

⁸Garrison and DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ* (St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1948), p. 389.

⁹Campbell, *Ibid.*, Vol. 1-Extra, p. 16.

¹⁰Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. I, p. 30.

¹¹*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 31.

¹²*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 136.

¹³*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 13.

ciled, adopted, and saved: *on the other they are in a state of condemnation.* This act is sometimes called immersion, regeneration, or conversion.¹⁴

Question—"Who are the members of a church of Christ?"

Answer—"Those only who voluntarily and joyfully submit to him as lawgiver, prophet, priest, and king: who assume him as their saviour, die to sin, *are buried with him*, and rise to walk in a new life."¹⁵

Those writings show us that Campbell did understand the significance of baptism as connected with salvation.

In apparent contradiction to all this is the concept found frequently throughout his writings that speaks of "disciples" of Christ or "Christians in the sects."

The following was written by Campbell in the *Christian Baptist* in the year 1825:

I have no idea of seeing, nor wish to see, the sects unite in one grand army. This would be dangerous to our liberties and laws. For this the Saviour did not pray. It is only the *disciples dispersed among them* that reason and benevolence would call out of them . . .¹⁶

On the evening before Campbell departed to debate with Mr. Owen, he wrote in the issue of the *Christian Baptist* of April 6, 1829:

I rejoice to know and feel that I have the good wishes, the prayers, and the hopes of myriads of *Christians in all denominations*.¹⁷

For our last excerpt from the *Christian Baptist* we go to the issue of October 1826.

I suppose all agree that *among Christians of every name there are disciples* of Jesus Christ, accepted of God in him, *real members of his body*, branches in the true vine, and therefore all one in Christ.¹⁸

The following exchange is representative of the positions taken in the *Millennial Harbinger*:

Question—"Would you say that the different Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodistic, and Baptist sects, are built upon any other foundation than the New Testament?"

Answer—"They say so themselves; for they have each formed a covenant or constitution, rules and laws for their own government, and do require more or less than the Christian institutions for admission into, or continuance in, their communities. *None of them will receive or retain all the disciples of Christ.*"¹⁹

Question—"Are there, then, no disciples of Christ in these sects?"

Answer—"There are, no doubt, many."

Campbell argued that, there being Christians in the sects, attend-

¹⁴*Ibid.*, Vol. I-Extra, p. 12.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 351.

¹⁶Vol. II, p. 85.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 239.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 53.

¹⁹*Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. III, p. 362.

ing worship with such congregations did not warrant the conclusion that the sects were justified:

So there being Christians in any sectarian commonwealth, or a sectarian in any Christian commonwealth, does not change the nature or character of such a commonwealth.²⁰

When asked what he thought was the duty of all Christians among the sects, he said (in the same place), "They are commanded to 'Come out of them'." (Rev. 18:4)²¹

In the first volume of the *Millennial Harbinger* this statement was made: "Then none of the unimmersed can be saved; for none can enter the kingdom of God, but those born of water." To this, Campbell replied:

This is or is not true, according as you understand the term saved. For the present salvation of the gospel is that salvation into which we enter, when we become citizens of the kingdom of God. But whether they may enter into the kingdom of future and eternal glory after the resurrection, is a question much like that question long discussed in the schools; viz. Can infants who have been quickened, but who died before they were born, be saved? We may hope the best, but cannot speak with the certainty of knowledge. . . *We have no authority to speak comfortably to them who will not submit to the government of the Saviour.*

Many persons, I doubt not, who never were informed on these matters, but simply mistook the import and design of the institution, who were nevertheless honestly disposed to obey, and *did obey as far as they were instructed*, may, as the devout Jews and Patriarchs who lived before the Christian era, *be admitted into the kingdom of future glory.* . . I am sure of one thing; because the decree is published; viz. that he that believes the gospel and is immersed shall be saved; and he who submits not to the government of Jesus Christ shall be condemned.²²

When asked if he expected to sit down in heaven with all Christians of all sects and, if so, why not sit down at the same table with them here, he said,

It is time enough to behave as they do in heaven when we meet there. I expect to meet with those whom we call Patriarchs, Jews, and Pagans, in heaven. . . *Some of all these sort of people may be fellow-citizens in heaven.* . . I do expect to meet with some of "all nations, tribes, and tongues," in the heavenly country. But while on earth I must live and behave according to the order of things under which I am placed.²³

The Lunenburg letter is, then, to be interpreted in the light of its context. Campbell seems to be saying that immersion is definitely required to become a member of the kingdom of God or the church. But he goes on to say that it has not been a requirement for all in all ages for eternal life. He feels that many who obey as far as they are instructed may be admitted into the kingdom of future glory. He would also say that there is a chance that one may mistake the im-

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 363.

²¹*Ibid.*

²²Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. I-Extra, p. 30.

²³*Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 193.

port and design of baptism. He seems to feel that if a person does this honestly, there is a chance he may receive eternal life. Campbell said many times that what he said about Christians in the sects was merely his opinion. These were the ones who had done all that they honestly knew to do.

One last quotation shows the real attitude that Campbell had.

But the question is, are we authorized to make the sincerity and honesty of a person's mind a rule of our conduct? *'Tis God alone who is judge of this*, and surely he would not require us to act by a rule which we can never apply to the case. Neither, perhaps, is it a fair position *to assume that any man's sincerity in opinion or belief will have any weight in the final judgment*; but whether or not, it cannot be a rule of our proceeding in any case. We judge from actions—*God judges the heart*; and, therefore, we look for visible obedience; and when we are assured that the Lord has commanded every man to confess him, or to profess the faith and be immersed into his name, *we can never justify ourselves* before God or man in presuming in our judgment of charity to set aside his commandment, and in accepting for it a human substitute.²⁴

Surely Campbell's idea that if one had never had opportunity to hear the truth or study the Bible, but had done all that he knew of right and wrong and all he knew to do to be a Christian, he might be considered a Christian in an imperfect sense and the Lord might save him is of little comfort to those who set aside the plain teaching of the New Testament when they have learned it. Campbell's insistence that those in error come out of denominationalism is decisive as is his plain teaching that baptism for remission of sins is a part of the New Testament pattern.

²⁴Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. II, p. 393.

A Note on the Preposition *eis* in Matthew 12:41

J. W. Roberts

The claim for a causal meaning of *eis* in Acts 2:38 has led to a discussion of the use of *eis* in other contexts.¹ One of the passages for which a meaning of "because of" is claimed for the preposition is Matthew 12:41: "Because they repented at the preaching of Jonah" (*hoti metenoiesan eis to kerugma Jona*). Typical of the comments is that of Robertson in his exegesis of Acts 2:38. He says the meaning "because" is "seen in Matt. 12:41 about the preaching of Jonah . . . They repented because of (or at) the preaching of Jonah."²

The purpose of this short paper is to demonstrate that this exegesis does not represent the consensus of the standard grammars and lexicons and that it does not satisfy the idiom.

Let it be noted first that the word "preaching" is not the participle (*kerusson*) or the action noun (*kerugmos*), but is the noun *kerugma*, "the message" or "proclamation" of Jonah. The idea is not merely "because Jonah preached" but the attitude of the people toward his proclamation. The paraphrases of Moffatt and Goodspeed in their translations "when Jonah preached" is thus really wide of the mark. Winer-Moulton's listing of this passage under the classification of the "occasion" reflects the same mistake of considering the *kerugma* as the act of preaching. So also does the explanation "*impulsi praedicatione Jonae*" ("moved by the preaching of Jonah" JWR) of Zorell. More correct is the translation of Chas. B. Williams³ which reads "They turned to the message preached by Jonah," though "turned" is not an adequate rendering of *metanoieo*.

The use of *eis* to express the attitude or reaction of a person to something or someone is a standard lexical classification of the preposition. This is what is represented by the translation "at" the preaching of Jonah in all the standard translations. Jannaris lists as one of the subdivisions of the preposition: "to denote a feeling toward, as *philia*, *echtha eis tina*; *diabolos legein eis tina*, *eis ti*."⁴ Jannaris also points out that this same idea can be expressed by *pros*. Blass-Debrunner⁵ says that *eis* in Matt. 12:41 has the sense of *pros* and cites a passage in Herodotus where a king made a proclamation (*kerugma*) and the people were unwilling "at the proc-

¹See "Baptism for Remission of Sins—A Critique," *Restoration Quarterly*, Vol. 1, p. 226-234, (4th Quarter) 1957, esp. pp. 233f.

²Robertson, A. T., *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (New York, Harper, 1930), Vol. 111.

³Williams, Charles B., *The New Testament* (Chicago, Moody Press, 1954).

⁴Jannaris, A. N., *An Historical Greek Grammar* (London, MacMillan, 1897), p. 376. The Greek phrases mean "friendship, enmity toward someone; to speak slander at someone, something."

⁵Blass, F., and Debrunner, A., *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), Sec. 207.1.

lamation" to go contrary to its stipulation. Arndt and Gingrich's new translation of Bauer's lexicon⁶ cites the usage "after the verbs *aporemiai*, *diakrinomai*, *kauchaomai*, *parrasian echo*." These verbs when followed by *eis* mean: "I am at a loss at," "I hesitate at," "I boast at," and "I have boldness at."⁷ This lexicon wavers between this meaning for Matt. 12:41 and the "causal" meaning of *eis* which is included in view of the Marcus-Mantey debate over it, but which is termed by the translators as "controversial."

A check of Moulton and Geden's *Concordance to the Greek Testament* reveals that this usage is quite frequent in the New Testament. The following list of expressions is parallel to the use of *eis* in Matthew 12:41: "I am offended at" (*skandalizo eis*) Matt. 18:6; "I rail at" or "blaspheme" (*blasphemeo eis*) Mark 3:29; "I hesitate at" (*diakrinomai eis*) Rom. 4:20; "I am pleased at" (*eudokeo eis*) 2 Pet. 1:17; "I am bold at" (*tharreo eis*) 2 Cor. 10:1; "I have hope at or toward" "I have my hope set on" (*elpizo eis*) 1 Pet. 3:5; John 5:45; (*echon elpida eis*) Acts 24:15⁸; "I have boldness at entering" (*eis eisodon*) Heb. 10:19; "I have enmity at (toward) something or someone" (Cf. Rom. 8:7; Liddell-Scott also give this usage and say it may be interchanged with *pros*, e.g., A. Pr. 491); "I take thought before at something" (*pronoian me poieisthe eis*) Rom. 13:14; "I am rich toward something or somebody" (*plouton eis*).

The above list of verbs may be accompanied by another group of constructions in which the noun implying the action is followed by *eis* indicating the thing or person or occasion toward which the action is directed. Consider these: "Endure gainsaying at" (Heb. 12:3); "love toward a name" (Heb. 6:10); "love toward somebody" (Rom. 6:8); "devotion toward" (Rom. 12:10); "faith toward" (Acts 20:21). Notice especially "repentance toward" God (*metanoian eis theon*) Acts 20:21. Compare Ignatius *To Smyrna*, 9, *ananephein kai metanoiein eis theon*, "to sober up and repent toward God."

A consultation of Liddell-Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (9th Edition) not only confirms most of the above expressions as normal usage, but shows that the list could be extended indefinitely, e.g., "laugh at" (*gelao eis*) S. Aj. 79; "be alarmed at" (*phobeo eis*) S. OT, 980.

⁶Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago U. Press, 1957).

⁷The interpretation adopted by McGarvey (*New Testament Commentary on Matthew and Mark*) and others that the passage means that they repented so as to come under or into the teaching of Jonah is possible and has parallels. 1 Cor. 10:1 "baptized unto Moses" is sometimes cited as a parallel, Moses being understood by metonymy as standing for his teaching or instruction. This construction is not so common and does not fit the context of the construction as a whole as does the one herein adopted. Compare 2 Tim. 2:25 "repentance *eis* the knowledge of the truth."

⁸This idiom is common: Cf. Isa. 51:5; Psal. 144 (145):15; Sir. 2:9; Bar. 16:1; Herodian 7; Sib. Or. 5:284; Josephus Wars, 6:99.

This idiom corresponds with our English usage. The G & C Merriam's Unabridged Dictionary under the use of "at" denoting "direction, terminal point or end" lists a subdivision "e. an object of action, effort, or emotional concern; in the direction of; towards, as to look at it; to aim *at* a mark, to strike, point, shout, wink, mock, laugh, be angry *at* one" etc. This suits the construction very well.

It is quite evident in the illustrations given from the N. T. that the meaning of *eis* after verbs of this type is not "because." It is true that "because" would make sense in some of the instances; but to say that some meaning would make sense is not to demonstrate that this is either an accepted meaning of the construction or that it is the meaning in the particular passage.

In the majority of the passages "because" would not even fit as the meaning. One does not "have friendship" or "enmity" because of a person, but rather "toward" a person, as these expressions mean. Mk. 3:29 does not mean "rail because" but "at" a person. 2 Cor. 10:1 does not mean "I am bold because of" but "I am bold toward" or as Goodspeed translates "bold in dealing with you." One does not "gainsay" because of a person or doctrine, but "at" or toward it.

It is admitted that the reason for the repentance of the city of Nineveh was the preaching of Jonah. But it is denied that this is what is expressed by *repentance eis*. If Jesus had meant to say this he would certainly have made his meaning plain by using *dia* with the accusative, the regular preposition to express cause.

On the basis of this study, it is quite evident that Matthew 12:41 means that the people of Nineveh reacted toward the message or proclamation of Jonah by repenting.

Personalia

Frank Van Dyke received the B.A. degree from Wabash College and the Master's from Abilene Christian college. His article in this issue is based upon his Master's Thesis.

Glenn Paden is a candidate for the Master's degree at Abilene Christian college.

Paul Rotenberry received his M. A. degree from the University of Pennsylvania, 1951. He is Assistant Professor of Bible and Greek at ACC. Now on leave to complete his doctorate at Vanderbilt U., he has done work in a number of other places including Dropsie and Chicago.

Bob R. Winter is the preacher for the church of Christ in Fredericksburg, Virginia and is a senior at Union Seminary, Richmond, Va.

Other authors whose works are included in this issue are on the board of the *Restoration Quarterly*. Consult the inside cover page.

The Faith and Contemporary Theology

J. D. Thomas

(Editor's Note: The following lecture was delivered as a part of the Lectures at Lubbock Christian College and has been published as a part of the volume of those lectures for 1957. It is printed here with consent of the publishers of that volume in order to give it the widest possible circulation.)

People that we designate at "Modernists" honestly feel that their challenge cannot be met by anyone who takes the Bible as literal religious authority. They all feel that "Fundamentalists," as they would designate us, were beaten down in the great Fundamentalist-Modernist debates of a few decades ago. Particularly they feel that the ground has been cut out from under us by what they call "the assured results of Biblical criticism." They feel that the idea of an inerrant Bible is no longer possible—that scientific facts have been demonstrated which destroy it as a religious authority and, therefore, they seek their religious authority through other channels. In view of these facts it is easy to understand why a Modernist feels that any person who accepts the Bible as religious authority is obscurantist, unscientific and outmoded, and they even count us difficult to talk to because they really feel that we are unwilling to face what they consider to be demonstrated facts.

The History of Modernism

Several factors combined during the periods of the Renaissance and Reformation to destroy the faith of many people in the Bible as religious authority. The Medieval view of the universe was that God was personally instrumental in all of the activities of nature—he sent the rain, each stroke of lightning, and controlled all of the great natural events according to his specific desire of the moment. There was no thoroughgoing concept of "natural law" as we know it today. The discovery that the world was round; the new Copernican theory that the sun was the center of the universe and that the several planets moved about the sun and about each other with regularity, thus establishing the view of the uniformity of nature and of the universe as one grand organized system; the development of scientific thinking under Galileo to the point where a scientific hypothesis could be proved or disproved by empirical observation; the philosophical arguments between the rationalists and the empiricists as to the correct procedure of arriving at truth; and the particular argument between the Roman Catholics and Martin Luther over what constitutes true religious authority, caused the searchlight to be turned on the Bible in a way that no one had ever thought of looking at it before. The Humanists and Freethinkers of that day began to point out what appeared to be problem areas within the Bible, and since man in general came to accept the universe as operating by a uniform natural law and that God's constant providential ac-

tivity was thus not necessary, many people were willing to look now at the Bible as though it were an ordinary human production and they accepted the criticisms about it as true, even though they were quite limited in Biblical knowledge and were seeing it from a restricted viewpoint.

The philosophy of this day was strongly concerned not only with problems of Metaphysics, or what actually constitutes reality, and such problems as the existence and the nature of God, but they were concerned primarily with the epistemological problems of *knowledge*—how true knowledge might be determined, whether by rationalism, empiricism, intuition, or other, or through a combination of methods. In short, it was a willingness, brought about by a combination of circumstances, to have a new look at everything that had been formerly accepted, with the demand that truth *prove* itself. The *coup de grace* (in the thinking of these people) was delivered in the 19th century by Charles Darwin with his theory of evolution, and many who had not lost their faith before did so at this time.

Largely out of the 17th and 18th centuries there developed a systematic criticism of the Bible along the lines of Hegelian Philosophy, which argues for *natural development*, even of ideas, so that supernatural conclusions were now not even considered possible and the Bible was looked upon as a purely human book. The Biblical criticism thus started was developed later to cover practically every phase of Biblical study, and theories were evolved which attempted to explain such things as the origin of the Pentateuch; the origin of the Synoptic Gospels and their relationship to each other; the work of the prophets; the work of Paul; and the history of the early church, as all being on a naturalistic basis.

Schools of Modernism

Modernism has been designated as “a crowd, rather than an army.” Certainly there is no unifying principle that governs it in an overall way, and probably its only point of unity is the discounting of any real authority that the Bible itself has.

The crux of the development of Modernism came at the close of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries in what might now be called Old Liberalism. This school of thought dominated the entire field of Modernism. They had formulated many systematic doctrines and had pretty well come to accept a somewhat philosophically-based outlook. They were strong on empirical science and were almost humanist in their elevation of man to the center of the stage. They were quite optimistic about human achievements and really believed that with a little more time man would evolve a “kingdom of God on earth” through his educational and scientific accomplishments.

Succeeding the Old Liberals in the period immediately following the first World War were the group now commonly known as Neo-Orthodox or “new orthodox.” This group came about as a result of

the application of existential philosophy (largely in the place of Hegelian philosophy) in the minds of those who had been Liberals. Because of the terms used by the Neo-Orthodox, some of their conclusions might seem to be the same conclusions as those of the Old Orthodox, or Protestant Conservatives of the Reformation period, and thus they were designated as "Neo-Orthodox." In reality, however, their theological views were far removed from anything that could rightly be called Orthodox, because theologically they are an extension of Liberalism, and since they use Orthodox terms with different meanings they are not really orthodox at all. Neo-Orthodoxy, however, has a "message of salvation" for the "predicament of modern man" which the Liberal found himself without; and that is why many Liberals of the past thirty to forty years have left Liberalism. At the present moment, therefore, many consider Liberalism to be outmoded, old-fashioned, and even naive. However, quite a few Modernist theologians of the present day still hold that there were distinctive gains made in Liberalism and they want to cling onto such values as long as they possibly can.

Important names in Neo-Orthodoxy include such men as *Søren Kierkegaard* (1813-1855), the Danish philosopher who "invented" existentialist philosophy; *Karl Barth*, who in 1919, in the preface to his *Commentary on Romans*, issued a blistering indictment against Liberal scholarship, charging them with utter failure in getting the meaning of the Bible because of their extremely objective, scientific approach; *Emil Brunner*, an early companion of Barth in this movement but who separated from him because Brunner favored a more "natural theology," and he differed from Barth somewhat as to the place of the Bible, and on other views; *Rudolf Bultmann* was also an early friend of Barth and an existential theologian, but he has held to a higher appreciation of Biblical criticism than the other important men in Neo-Orthodoxy; and the important American Neo-Orthodox theologian, *Reinhold Niebuhr* of Union Seminary in New York, who has probably made a greater contribution to the overthrow of Liberal theology than any other single man, and *Paul Tillich*, formerly at Union Seminary but now at Harvard and who is counted by some as the world's foremost theologian of the present time. Although Tillich holds to Neo-Orthodoxy, he is probably more independent in this respect than the others and might be said to hold his own personal theology. However, this could really be said of all of them because they differ a great deal from each other.

In the wake of the struggles between Neo-Orthodoxy and Liberalism, as the former wrested the center of the stage from the latter, there have arisen certain "clusters" of theological thought somewhere between these two major groups, which might be considered as the Post-Liberals, or Neo-Liberals; the Modern Orthodox; and the "Kerygmatic" group, which probably gives a higher evaluation to the Bible itself than any of these other groups, but which interprets it "mythologically" and therefore is still quite modernistic in outlook.

Doctrines of Modernism

Man's ultimate source of values, from a philosophical point of view, are three: Supernaturalism, Humanism, and Naturalism. No one of the three could be empirically *proved* as the correct one; and we find that men select one of the three as their ultimate source of values, depending upon which one they feel gives the best overall explanations in a total world view. Liberalism has accepted *Naturalism*, as far as the Bible is concerned, and although many Liberals do believe in God, as a sort of Cosmic Power, there is no Liberal who holds to the supernatural personal God, in the same sense that the Bible presents Jehovah to be. Their interest in objective, scientific epistemology precludes their acceptance of anything that might be called miraculous, and this fact would work against their chances of ever arriving at a definite Bible outlook. The Neo-Orthodox, on the other hand, accept the Supernatural as a part of their original pre-suppositions but as far as the Bible and Biblical criticism is concerned, they hold the same pre-suppositions as the Liberals, so that the Bible is not authoritative for them either, according to ordinary methods of interpreting language.

Religious authority to the Liberal is religious-experience. This means that "Revelation" does not need to have "truth content." It cannot be stated in a proposition, or communicated completely in words to others. Since the authority of Revelation is not "propositional" to a Liberal, then the Bible is not authority to him and has value only incidentally, in whatever way its use might cause him to have religious experiences. The Liberal is hard put, however, when he is confronted with such religious "experiences" as orgiastic rites, child sacrifice, or temple prostitution, as have been experienced by religious people of the past. Authority for the Neo-Orthodox thinkers would also be religious experience, of a miscellaneous type, but usually in what they consider to be a definite "confrontation of the individual by God" at the "existential" moment, or at the moments of one's life when he seriously ponders the meaning of existence and major problems that he has to face in life. The Existentialist believes that God confronts man in an immediate, direct way at such moments and makes possible for him a choice or a commitment. This subjective experience is to the Neo-Orthodox at once: faith, revelation, and authority; and also here the Bible has value only as it assists the individual in coming into "confrontation with God."

Neo-Liberals and Modern Orthodox groups would modify the views of Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy to a degree, with respect to the authority of the Bible, but the Kerygmatic group, represented perhaps best by Bultmann in matters of authority and interpretation, believes in allowing the Bible to have more value than do other groups of Modernists. We will discuss Bultmann's view of interpretation later, but we note that he does believe that *every part* of the Bible has authority, although he would hold this to be true only when it is "existentially" interpreted or, to use his term, "de-mythologized."

All Modernists hold that the church developed somewhat naturally, with revelation being more in historical events than in words, and none of them believe that Jesus planned to build the church, with any idea of its being a permanent on-going institution, but they hold that a *development* of the early church was the result of ideas of the early Christians, who rewrote the accounts of Jesus' life in a way that made it *appear that he said* that he was going to build the church, and that he established the Lord's Supper, commanded baptism, etc. Strictly speaking, to them the first century church had no "organization"; and indeed it had several different origins, based on the different emphases of different groups that composed it. One man, for instance, finds eight separate religions in the New Testament. Eventually, however, the *Petrine* Christians and the *Pauline* Christians came to be the major divisions, and the generally accepted Modernist view of early church history is, then, that the real church was not formed until about 180 A.D., and it came about as a "blending" of these two movements, in the work of Irenæus. *Orthodoxy* was thus brought into being as a result of the conflicts of early Christians with the second century heretical movements, and it did not exist until late in the second century. In short, in the Modernist viewpoint, there was no such thing as a standard, orthodox Christianity; no standard *organization* of the church; no pattern of doctrines before 180 A.D., and the church that was thus founded with this "rise of Orthodoxy," they count to be the "Old Catholic church."

As to Modernistic views of the person of Jesus Christ, we might point out that old Liberals are interested only in the "historical Jesus," the son of Mary, who lived in Nazareth, whom they really believe to be but an ordinary man, whose own personal religion or piety is worthy of being an example for us. Jesus is thus not the transcendental Saviour of the sinner, but simply the first Christian. The authority of Jesus to the Liberal is not in his words or his deeds nor in his claim to divinity, but in the fact that he personally had religious experiences of high quality and his life is able to prompt unusually deep religious insight in others. He is not really "Christ," but that term is simply a fictitious invention of the early church.

The Neo-Orthodox view of Christ in general rejects the "historical Jesus" as having any particular value but they consider the "Christ of Faith" concept, which the church came to have later, as being the most wonderful religious idea that men have ever known. They also do not believe that Jesus of Nazareth is to be identified with this "Christ of Faith"; thus they are not particularly interested in the historical Jesus, but they "go all out" for the "Christ of Faith," which concept they feel God caused *in the minds* of the early Christians through historical events, and which, for existential interpretation, has some revelatory value. Bultmann and the Kerygmatic school again would give more consideration to the possibility of relationship between the historical Jesus and the Christ of Faith than the others, as we shall see in the next paragraph.

As to Interpretation, the Liberals hold the Bible simply to be a *record of the religious experiences* of people who lived in the Jewish-Christian tradition, and thus is a wonderful record, but it definitely is human in its production, and therefore fallible. Its interpretation is to be made along lines that allow for its humanness and for the understanding that religious ideas evolve on a naturalistic basis. The miraculous and the supernatural must be subtracted at every point. The Neo-Orthodox holds further that the Bible has more revelation "between the lines" than perhaps the Liberals hold, although they also insist that it is humanly produced and is only a *record* of religious experiences; but in general they would allow for more validity in the Bible than would the Liberals. They interpret important sections with what we might call "symbolic" interpretation, for instance, Niebuhr would say that the Garden of Eden story has validity when it is symbolically interpreted. It is not literally true, but he would not throw it away altogether and classify it as mere legend, as the Liberal does. Bultmann's view of interpretation, which has been gaining adherents from all of the Modernist camps in the recent past, is that the Bible was written in terms of "myth." By this he does not mean something that is merely legendary or untrue, but something which he believes to have been written in the thought-forms and in the highly symbolic language of a former day, when people thought differently from what they do today. For instance, he would not "throw away" any part of the Bible but simply says that with our 20th-Century outlook and thought forms, our minds are not able to penetrate to the real meaning of such matters as demons; Jesus coming on the clouds; heaven above and hell below, making a "three-story universe"; and similar matters. He says this is all mythological expression, which serves as a garment, clothing the true message of "salvation," but which actually hides it from the modern mind, since it had meaning for the people of its own day but it cannot have the same meaning for us today and thus should not be taken literally. We, of course, understand that a great deal of the Bible is written in figurative language and we also understand that proper Biblical interpretation requires that we distinguish between what is only temporal, and those principles in scripture which are enduringly valid, but Bultmann's demand that in interpretation the message must be "de-mythologized" calls for far more drastic treatment than anything yet proposed, because he does not limit "myth" to only the highly figurative or symbolic parts of the Bible, rather he makes the *bulk* of the gospel message to be that way. Such central terms as the Cross, the Resurrection, Miracles, the Holy Spirit—central matters, which all men have heretofore considered to be permanent and abiding principles of Biblical teaching, Bultmann now tells us are mythological and have to be existentially interpreted. For instance, he says we cannot "throw out" the Resurrection from the gospel story since it has much validity for the Christian of today; however, he does not believe that there was a literal resuscitation of

the physical body of Jesus. The existential interpretation of the Resurrection account means simply that the Christian of today "comes alive in Christ."

An excellent description of Bultmann's views are contained in the following quotation. (The work from which it is taken has just been issued and is the clearest description of Bultmann's theology that is available in a short compass.)

In our generation, Bultmann and his allies have discovered a similar rejection among modern unbelievers of a supernaturally focused Christianity; that is, of a Christianity looking for invasions from the supernal regions above and the demonic regions below. Such occurrences simply do not take place in the kind of a universe in which we live. Here Bultmann stands with the scientifically-minded man of today. He holds that it is true for anyone "old enough to think for himself," that God does not live "in a local heaven. There is no longer any heaven in the traditional sense of the word. The same applies to hell in the sense of a mythical underworld beneath our feet. And if this is so, we can no longer accept the story of Christ's descent into hell or his Ascension into heaven as literally true. We can no longer look for the return of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven or hope that the faithful will meet him in the air (1 Thess. 4:15ff)."

The result of this scientific point of view is that modern man can tolerate no traffic with those views and practices which stress the mediation of supernatural endowment through religious rite and miracle. Hence it is incomprehensible to him that "baptism in water can convey a mysterious something which is henceforth the agent of all his decisions and actions," that physical food (in the Lord's Supper) conveys spiritual strength, that the unworthy receiving of the bread and wine can result in spiritual sickness and even death (1 Cor. 11:30), that one can be baptized for the dead (1 Cor. 15:29), and that a dead body can rise again. Modern man's difficulties with such conceptions arise from the fact that his "view of the world which has been moulded by modern science and the modern conception of human nature (is that of) a self subsistent unity immune from the interference of supernatural powers." With these objections of modern man Bultmann is in strongest sympathy. He feels that something should be done for him by setting the supernatural elements in the Bible in their proper perspective. He proposes to do this through what he calls "*entmythologisierung*" (demythologizing), thereby relieving modern man of the burden of the mythological elements in the Bible, of which there are many, by interpreting them existentially that he may live by them rather than their being an offense to him.

The fact of the matter is that the Christ-event, so important to him who reads the New Testament, is surrounded by myth: the preexistent Logos; the heaven-descended Messiah; the conception by the Holy Ghost; the birth from a virgin; the resurrection; the ascension; the one yet to come. The important thing about all these declarations, however, is neither their facticity nor non-facticity, but what they mean for our living here and now. Uninterpreted, these mythological elements surrounding the life and activity of Jesus are incredible to the

scientifically trained man who is committed to the rigid cause-effect world of modern science. Struggle as he may to do so, he cannot cast off the world of reliable structure and determinable causation, which is his rightful inheritance, for the surprising, miracle-upsetting world of the first century. Nor indeed does Bultmann think he should be asked to do so. What he should be asked to do is to discern the existential meaning (significance for our life), which these ancient mythological accounts seek to present.¹

There is, thus, much greater danger in Neo-Orthodoxy and even in Bultmann's views than there ever was in Liberalism because they use normal Biblical terms but with existential meanings, which are far removed from truth. The Old Liberals made no bones about telling us that the Bible is full of mistakes and much of it has to be thrown away—that it was purely naturalistic, that man came by evolution and that there were no real answers for man's serious problems. The newer Modernist, however, can preach with the Bible's words and offer what they call a "salvation to sinsick man." They make him think, in the name of modern scholarship, that they are giving him the real answers for his needs, but actually they are even further from the truth of God's will than man has ever been before.

The central points of their doctrines and their final conclusions are arrived at by subjective thinking and not by any objective basis whatever. It is understandable to want to be able to supply *answers* for man's many needs, but since these people had already ruled the Bible out of court, they had no other place to turn than to existential philosophy for answers. Yet all the while the Bible itself, when understood from the point of view of the plain man of the street, will furnish all of the answers that man needs and even better ones than these men are able to provide, and there is no cause for thinking that the Bible is unscientific or contradicts any known truth today when it is properly interpreted.

Meeting the Challenge

As is evident from the above discussion Modernism in religion might be likened somewhat to radio-active materials in the scientific world—they are quite dangerous to handle. Proper educational background to know where, when, and how to take hold of them, is certainly the only way to meet the challenge of Modernism. It is somewhat saddening when occasionally one hears or reads of an uninformed gospel preacher calling almost any and everything "Modernism," when in reality all that he is communicating to you is that he does not like the thing in question. For a minister to spend much time talking about Modernism when really he does not know enough about it to definitely recognize it in one of its many forms, is really for him to advertise to the world that he is not a dependable religious adviser.

¹George W. Davis, *Existentialism and Theology*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1957, pp. 18-20.

At the local level, the gospel preachers should somehow learn enough about philosophy and Modernistic theology and their inter-relationships that they can carry on an intelligent conversation with people of college level concerning them. This does not mean that one should preach these matters from the pulpit necessarily, but it does mean he should be able to give a firm and meaningful answer to people who are troubled with these matters, so that he can maintain their respect. To try to discuss them with anything short of this ability would probably result in driving the prospect into Modernism.

On the theological and philosophical level we need to have sound teachers on the faculties of our colleges who are thoroughly enough acquainted with these views and their implications to ground our young preaching brethren adequately before they go out into a world that is filled with such ideas. At the top level we can hope some day to have brethren write books, in the terms and at the level that the deepest thinkers of Modernism write, and pointing up in a scholarly way the weaknesses of their views and how that the simple Biblical faith is the one and only answer.

The general starting point of Modernist pre-suppositions has been to reject the supernatural, particularly as it concerns the Bible. We should realize that in the whole outlook of things the supernatural is definitely possible and man has no real right to reject it. He should indeed consider such a possibility, specifically in view of the fact that the Bible claims to be supernatural, and more especially in view of the fact that the Bible is such a wonderful book. Indeed the origin of the Bible and its influence in all the two thousand years of Church History cannot possibly be explained on a purely naturalistic basis. There are many other factors concerning the Bible and the Christian religion that are best explained by considering the supernatural, yea even miracles, as possible.

Modernists reject the Bible because they feel that the "assured results of Biblical criticism" have destroyed its infallibility and inerrancy. The true Christian need not fear any known fact, or fact that may ever be known. Before we grant that Biblical criticism has produced embarrassing facts, we need to study the case of each particular argument completely to see whether the things are so. The *basic* conclusion of Biblical criticism concerning the Old Testament is the Documentary Hypothesis of the origin of the Pentateuch; and for the New Testament is their solution of the Synoptic problem, where they consider that Matthew and Luke copied from Mark and from "Q," a *supposed* document brought into use merely to supply this need. Many modernists themselves, however, have already given up the Documentary Hypothesis and are seeking some other naturalistic solution, and it is interesting to note that within the past year a question has now been publicly raised about the existence of "Q." There is no "assured result of Biblical criticism" that might be embarrassing to us; but which upon careful and detailed examination will prove to be founded upon subjective reasoning only.

The roots of Modernism are grounded in human philosophy and if Modernists would be willing in all humility to hunger and thirst after righteousness sufficiently to study the Bible thoroughly considering the possibility that it is the inspired and authoritative word of God presenting a unified and systematic presentation of his scheme of redemption, seeking at all problem points to resolve the difficulties, they would be amazed to find deep and meaningful answers to their problems of life and to the basic philosophical questions that men have pondered. Biblical answers for the human predicament, which allow a meaningful purpose for creation and human existence where man is expected to glorify God, furnishes a better method for getting the total truth than any human philosophy has ever done or can do.

“For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God’s good pleasure through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Seeing that Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling block, and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.” (I Cor. 1:21-24)

“Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.” (John 8:32)

Blessing In the Old Testament: A Study of Genesis 12:3

Paul Rotenberry

The Problem Stated

Since the appearance of the RSV of the OT, there has been much discussion of the section dealing with the blessing of Abraham, Gen. 12:1-3. The Hebrew text is rendered by the ASV: "and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." The RSV renders the same text: "and by you all the families of the earth will bless themselves." Many seem to fear that the rendering of the RSV destroys the messianic idea in the verse, and so they oppose the rendering.

Interpreting the Verse

Messianic. According to the messianic interpretation of the verse, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed . . . (ASV)" is understood to refer to the blessing received through Jesus the Messiah who came of the seed of Abraham, so that truly all families of the earth were blessed through Abraham. The new translation is just as susceptible of a messianic interpretation as the older translation, though with reflexive action. "By you all the families of the earth will bless themselves . . . (RSV)" is thus understood to mean that in the Messiah of the seed of Abraham, all the families of the earth would avail themselves of the blessings. Thus far, the new translation has really lost nothing of the reference to Christ seen in the verse by Christians from the early days of the church.

Non-messianic. The non-messianic interpretation of both translations would see in the verse only that the name of Abraham (or his descendants, Gen. 22:18) would be used in pronouncing a blessing. Notice the usage in Gen. 48:20 with the same Hebrew preposition "by thee" or "in thee" taken as instrumental. ASV "In thee will Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh." RSV "by you Israel will pronounce blessings, saying, God make you as Ephraim and as Manasseh . . ." In this sense, Gen. 12:3 would be understood to mean that when one "blessed himself" "in" or "by" Abraham, he would simply say, "God make me as Abraham" or one would be blessed by having someone say, "God make me as Abraham." The force of the words and the context of Gen. 12:3 alone would not determine the interpretation. Both are equally possible in the context.

The Early Christian Interpretation—Messianic

In the early church the messianic interpretation was given by inspired men, thus Peter (Acts 3:25f) and Paul (Gal. 3:8). This we accept without question. But this acceptance does not depend upon the passive translation of Gen. 12:3. The messianic idea is just as

clear whether the Hebrew be taken as reflexive or as passive: whether it be read "And . . . shall bless themselves . . ." or "and . . . shall be blessed . . ."

Some may wonder how one could accept the messianic interpretation of the New Testament quotations and yet admit the possibility of the difference of translation. Why did the RSV translators use the expression "bless themselves" in Gen. 12:3 and the expression "be blessed" in the NT quotations of this verse, whereas the word occurring in the Greek NT is the same form of the same word that occurs in the Greek translation (Septuagint) of Gen. 12:3? The solution to this problem is found in the text with which the translators worked in each instance. In the NT they worked with the Greek NT text; in the OT they worked with the Hebrew text, and presumably our Hebrew text of Gen. 12:3 is the same as that used by the translators who produced the Septuagint.

One may well doubt that the grammatical construction of a translation is to be regarded as inspired merely because it is quoted in the New Testament when the writer or speaker is simply giving the Septuagint rendering.¹ Now, if one should choose to make this an argument that God inspired the translation of the Niphal form as passive, the discussion must end there, for we accept Peter and Paul as inspired men. (However, one is then faced with more serious problems of text and canon, if this is taken as putting a divine seal on all selections of words, texts, and constructions in the Septuagint translation.) If, on the other hand, one understands that Peter and Paul were simply quoting the translation commonly used by their hearers and readers, then we may investigate the disposition of the Niphal form made by the Septuagint translators.²

The Hebrew Verb, Niphal Conjugation

In the Hebrew language, verbs are used in different forms to express person, number, voice, mode, tense, and extension of the root idea. The extension of the root idea of a verb is expressed by conju-

¹Editor's Note: Compare, for example, McGarvey's comment on Acts 7:14 where he explains the apparent contradiction between the figures 70 and 75 there and in Gen. 46:27 by saying that the difference is a difference between the Hebrew text of Gen. 46:27 and the Septuagint which Stephen was quoting and which was known by his hearers. *New Commentary on Acts of Apostles*, p. 120.

²The translation of T. J. Meek in *The Bible, An American Translation*, published by the University of Chicago Press, represents the Niphal of Gen. 12:3 as reciprocal: ". . . through you shall all the families of the earth invoke blessings on one another." This is a force perfectly proper to the Niphal conjugation, but it is a highly specialized force. This translation would limit the meaning of the passage to the use of the name of Abraham in pronouncing blessings and would, in the judgment of this writer, unduly restrict the action of the verb. New Testament usage of this verse could not be justified if the force of the Niphal in Gen. 12:3 be understood as reciprocal.

gations; thus, the Qal conjugation is the simple active or stative form, the Niphal is the reflexive or passive of the simple active, the Piel is factitive or intensive or denominative, the Pual is passive of the Piel, the Hiphil is causative, the Hophal is passive of the Hiphil, and the Hithpael is reflexive. These are the basic meanings of the conjugations. With reference to the word "b-r-k" (translated "bless"), the problem of translation in the RSV centers in the Niphal conjugation which form occurs in Gen. 12:3. The earliest force of the Niphal conjugation in Hebrew was reflexive. Though in later Hebrew the Niphal came to be used more as a passive of Qal, the reflexive force was still common. Thus, Gen. 12:3 would in its earliest force be rendered "and they shall bless themselves" (the perfect tense occurring here with waw consecutive). But with many Hebrew verbs, the Niphal is used to express the passive voice only; and in many other verbs, the Niphal is used to express both passive and reflexive voices. So the use of the conjugation alone is not decisive. The Septuagint gives no help in this consideration for a Niphal is translated into Greek middle or passive voice as the translator understood the usage in the particular context. In the present and imperfect tenses of the indicative mode in Greek, the middle and passive voices are not distinguished in form, whereas the future middle is in a different verb system from the future passive. In Gen. 12:3, there is no possible confusion as to how the translator understood the Niphal. The Greek translated clearly the Niphal as future passive, which translation was cited by Peter and Paul in the NT.

The Niphal form of the verb b-r-k occurs only three times in the OT: Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 28:14. The Niphal is used often as a reflexive or passive of the Qal conjugation; however, the Qal (with the exception of the passive participle) occurs only twice in the OT and has the meaning "bend the knee" or "kneel" (2 Chron. 6:13; Psa. 95:6). The Qal passive participle does occur c. 72 times with the meaning "be praised" or "be blessed." The Piel form is the regular active form used in the sense "to bless"; the Pual form occurs as the passive of Piel "to be blessed." The Hiphil is the causative form of the root idea, "to cause to kneel" or "to cause to bend the knee." The Hithpael is properly reflexive "to bless oneself," but may bear the passive force "to be blessed." The Hithpael occurs only six times in the OT; in each passage, the RSV translates as a reflexive whereas the ASV translates three occurrences as passive (Gen. 22:18; 26:4; Psa. 72:17) and three occurrences as reflexive (Deut. 29:19; Isa. 65:16; Jer. 4:2). It should be noted that in each instance in which the text of the ASV translates the Hithpael as passive, the marginal reading is reflexive: "bless oneself." Also, one should note that the marginal reading of the RSV of Gen. 22:18 is passive: "be blessed."

The root idea of the verb b-r-k is "bend the knee," and the root is found throughout the Semitic family of languages with this meaning. In Hebrew, the Piel conjugation became specialized in the usage

"to bless." The Niphal and Hithpael conjugations are associated in meaning with the Piel; and the Qal passive participle is associated with the Piel and not at all with the active voice of the Qal. There are other Hebrew verbs in which this phenomenon is found, e. g. b-s-r "cut off." The Piel and Qal passive participle signify "fortify," the Niphal means "be restrained," the Qal active means "cut off." Of course, the Piel meaning is an extension of the root idea. (cf. also the root n-t-q). Furthermore, the root b-s-r also presents the Niphal in closer relationship (reflexive or passive) with the Piel than with the Qal. This shows a usage similar to that noted in the verb b-r-k. Thus, the Niphal on perfectly good linguistic grounds may rather be taken as a reflexive or passive of Piel than of Qal. That the Niphal need not be understood as passive can be readily seen in the verb d-b-r "speak" in which the Qal is active, the Niphal is middle-active, the Piel is active, and the Pual is passive.

B-R-K; Bless

The root meaning of the Hebrew verb b-r-k as already noticed is "bend the knee." As this was done in worship, it acquired the meaning "praise" or "bless" (give adoration to the deity). Since a "blessing" was spoken, the Greek translators uniformly render the verb by "eulogeo" with the force "praise" or "bless" (lit., to "speak well of," or to "speak good things"). The blessing to the Hebrew mind, however, does not correspond exactly to the English word "bless" as shown in that 's-r (lit., "go straight") "to be happy" is translated in Psa. 1:1 "Blessed is the man . . ." Even the English word "bless" has acquired many connotations far removed from the root idea "to consecrate with blood." In the Hebrew idea of blessing, there was always the "pronouncement" of blessing. The blessing was "something said." The word (blessing) spoken then began its work to effect that which was desired; thus, "God blessed them (sea creatures), saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas . . ." (Gen. 1:22). The "blessing" was what God "said," then the word of God produced its effect. (This shows also something of the meaning of the curse by Jehovah in Zech. 3:2.) We may see further this idea of blessing in Gen. 48:20 as Jacob says concerning Ephraim and Manasseh, "In thee will Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh . . ." Here again, the blessing was something spoken, and the spoken word was to effect that which was desired. We may work our way in each occurrence of the word throughout the entire Bible with this idea. There was something of the force of the whole personality involved in the blessing, and once given, it could not be recalled. So Isaac, having blessed Jacob, cannot recall the blessing and can give only a lesser blessing to Esau (Gen. 27:18-40; esp. vv. 37-40). A modern scholar expressed the idea quite well: "In the Bible blessing means primarily the active outgoing of the divine goodwill or grace which results in

prosperity and happiness amongst men.”³ Another said that ultimately all blessing must spring from God.⁴ For those to whom the work is available, the psychological interpretation of the blessing from the Hebrew viewpoint is well expressed by Johs. Pedersen.⁵

Conclusion

It appears more likely, therefore, that Gen. 12:3 has immediate reference to the use of Abraham’s name in pronouncing blessings, but that this interpretation must include a tacit recognition that through this Hero of Faith the Messiah also would come to pronounce new blessings of His own upon His people, Acts 3:25f; Gal. 3:8.

Abilene Christian College.

Abbreviations—

RSV—Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible

ASV—American Standard Version of the Holy Bible

OT— Old Testament

NT— New Testament

³A *Theological Word Book of the Bible*, ed. Alan Richardson, p. 33, art. “Bless,” by the editor.

⁴*Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, G. Kittel, Zweiter Band, ss. 751-763.

⁵*Israel*, Johs. Pedersen, vol. I-II, pp. 182-212.

The Problem of Man's Salvation

Bob R. Winter

The church proclaims Christ as victor. She has endeavored also to explain what "victor" means and just how this has been achieved. This attempt to put a divine saving act into human concept and thought is called Soteriology. To explain the salvation of man theologically is a perilous journey fraught with innumerable difficulties. This is because the human mind cannot comprehend divine mind. No man will ever completely understand the Atonement, but we must continue to try to understand in order to break this glad news to damned men, seeing in the very act of proclamation something of the saving act of God.¹

Atonement is the proclamation of a paradox, an antinomy, a complex of opposites. All through the theology of atonement are attempts to answer questions such as: (1) "Is it possible to preach grace without making light of sin?" Sin and grace are opposites. (2) "What about the past?" For all eternity the past will have happened and cannot be relived or redone, yet it must be reckoned with. This is antinomy. (3) "How is forgiveness possible?" Forgiveness is a process in the mind and heart of the one to whom wrong is done; yet it is actively re-establishing fellowship with the wrongdoer. This is paradox.

Hardly anyone will deny that man is in sin, but the Bible as the word of the Living God to and through living men, distinctively says that sin is in opposition to God. Further, the New Testament shows man to be far more sinful than the Law ever declared, for man killed Jesus Christ. Yet in an act of sheer mercy (grace), undeserved and at a terrible cost within the Godhead of which Calvary is the only measure, is man's sin forgiven. This is the declaration of Soteriology—a word which expresses nothing but the inability of man to explain a divine act—an act which expresses both the wrath of God and the love of God; paradox, the experience of a crucified Messiah suffering for the sin of others, yet having no sin Himself. God judges sin; God forgives sin.

1. God judges sin at the Cross. Are we shocked and indignant at Judas and Caiaphas? God forbid. An era which produced World War II can hardly pronounce judgment upon any previous age. All men are judged at the Cross, and all are found wanting. The world which put Christ to death is our world. It was not merely a little place at the eastern end of the Mediterranean but a part of us as well. The entire population of mankind, bar none, is guilty at the

¹II Cor. 5:19—*katallages*, "reconciliation."
Cross. The Cross makes plain that man is evil as well as good. Man

says "yes" to the divine word, but at the same time he says "no"; it is our own self-inflicted tragedy.

Look at Pilate. In terms of Roman justice and by the standards of the world at that time he was not particularly bad. In the Coptic Church of Abyssinia he is a saint. Pilate's affirmation, "I find no fault in him," is corrupted by political expediency. At the Cross all imperialism is judged and found wanting.

Look at Caiaphas. He was not a monster but a patriot, ready to crush as blasphemy anything that challenged the "sacredness" and stability of the Saducees.

These leaders were more zealous than corrupt. But we are like that too. The vital point is that in the presence of the One whose righteousness is perfect, our most fervent righteousness is filthy rags. Righteousness of man crucified the Son of God. This crowd was made up of people exactly like you and me. There are many idolatries made for man in the name of "democracy," and we are part of the process.

Christ's friends forsook him. We today dare not judge them. We are aware that men are coming up for judgment before Him. We are on trial before Him ourselves, and the world is in darkness at Calvary. God judges sin like this.

2. God bears sin in sacrificial love. These two facts make for paradox. Divine judgment on man's evil falls on the Divine Judge. He, the innocent one, bears man's ill-doing. In a moral universe this sounds absurd and "upside down." Here is something transcending man and begins to touch at the depth of the love of God.

The New Testament clue is provided by the Old Testament in Isaiah 52:13-ch. 53. These passages are unquestionably fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth and sent him to the cross. Jesus knew that death was more than judgment. He knew it was also redemption. "Surely he hath borne our sorrows." Atonement is a picture of God's grace in action. Man's lowest step against God is made God's highest step for man in bearing sin in the flesh of His Son.² The explanation, the "how," of this act is another matter. To attempt explanations involves the use of metaphor, for we are in a divine realm. *Kerygma* is an atonement message. In New Testament this is viewed in at least four ways.

Redemption

This idea is expressed by the *lutr-* cognates. This family of images deals with ransom and buying back at a price.³ Atonement is the price paid.⁴ The Atonement is ransom, but we do not know exactly

²I Cor. 15:1 ff.

³Matt. 20:28.

⁴I Tim. 2:6; Titus 2:14; I Pet. 1:18; Heb. 9:18.

from what; sin, devil, what? It is ransom from some kind of bondage. This is *apolutron* of the Greek Old Testament. In the O T it is used to translate two different ideas: (1) to release from slavery. By historic circumstances it is used of the Exodus; redemption from slavery. Therefore in the Septuagint it means release from bondage. In the N T it is the second Exodus. (2) To redeem as a family responsibility. This is taken from an intimate family situation. In the family structure of O T, responsibility falls on the nearest of kin. This is the redemption idea of the Book of Ruth. Boaz plays the part of a redeemer, a *go'el*, and as such is an ancestor of Christ. In N T Christ died that we might be released from slavery, "born of woman under the law." Christ entered into our sin.

Reconciliation

This concept is expressed by the *katalage* group of words.⁵ It speaks of enmity and hostility; the result of hostility on our part is wrath on God's part. The main emphasis is enmity, but this does not mean that God is angry; it is the wrath of God because of refusal of love. We must deal with the "wrath" of God and the "enmity" of man. At-one-ment removes hostility and the effects of hostility.⁶ It is a love that is shared.

Sacrifice

Here the *hilosmos*, *hilosterion* group is employed. There are two kinds of sacrifice. (1) The pagan concept is a compelling of the deity through sacrifice; the sacrifice viewed as an avenue to blessings from God; this idea is rejected in New Testament. N T does not think of sacrifice as compelling God to do anything. This is the view of Anselm, to get God to change His mind. It is a sacrifice of life because life has been given. (2) The other view is of sacrifice not merely as response but as itself a gift of God. It is life that has been brought out of death. In O T it is the offering of a slain animal which acts as the life of the offeror: "This is my life, so accept it." In Christ God graciously gives the gift, and the gift man offers is the gift of God already given by grace. The offering of the first-born son is the gift of God and return. Man does not give God half a life but his whole life. The only O T example of human sacrifice to God is Abram's offering Isaac at Moriah, the gift of a whole life. Isaac was a type of Christ.

Warfare

In N T atonement is the coming of God into human life and is a battle against hostile forces which hold man in bondage. It is a temporary dualism of life under the power of death and consequently under the judgment of God. The central idea is a divine conflict over

⁵II Cor. 5:17 ff.; emphasis is upon the world reconciled to God, not God to the world.

⁶Heb. 2:11 (RSV) "He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified have all one origin"; lit. "all out of one."

evil forces by which man is in bondage. The powers of bondage are evil, and Christ fights with them and releases man from judgment of the wrath of God. This image of atonement is evil overcome; it is salvation and beginning of a new life through participation in the victory. God in Christ conquers the Satanic might. Man's recognition of this might is a view to atonement. God cannot atone sin which man refuses to recognize, because man before union with Christ, participates in the character of this earthly power. "Like father, like son." Unification with Christ, however, brings victory. The believer has victory only by being united with Christ's victory.⁷ The proof of victory is in the Resurrection, and to this the believer is united in baptism, the symbol of Christ's triumph.

These passages of scripture are evidence of the various New Testament concepts about the Atonement. But, again, the language is metaphor, distinct but blended, to render it understandable to the mind of man.

II.

Historical writings outside the Bible have treated Soteriology along four general lines. In each age or period of Christian history the Church's doctrinal formulation on this matter was determined largely by the dominant modes of thought of that age.

The Ransom Theory

This is the representation of a ransom price paid to the devil by the life of Christ. It is a "trap" into which the devil falls because of the sinlessness of Christ. The Ransom theory is chiefly associated with Origen of Alexandria (185-255 A.D.).⁸ It became the dominant view of the Greek Patristic Period⁹ and Western theology until the Twelfth Century, although it did not go unchallenged. One theologian, Peter of Lombardy in the Twelfth Century, went so far as to say the Cross was a mousetrap baited by the blood of Christ. This particular view, of course, is too crude to stand.

Two decades ago, in 1937, a modified version of the Ransom theory was set forth by Bishop Gustaf Aulen of Sweden.¹⁰ Aulen presents this same theory as the "classic" view from Paul to Luther, with the exception of the period from c. 1200-1600. Aulen's view is void of the crudeness of the Patristic age, yet emphasizes the Pauline concept of invisible, demonic "principalities and powers" of the present

⁷1 Cor. 15:26, 24; Gal. 3:13; 1:4; Ro. 7; 8:35; Col. 2:15; Phil. 2:10.

⁸There are other concepts of Christ's work of Atonement in Origen, but Ransom is the dominant view. He speaks of propitiation of God and reconciling of men in *Commentary on John*.

⁹The view of Irenaeus (130-200) and later of Athanasius, has a medical idea, that evil is a disease and man must be inoculated against it. Incarnation deifies man by Christ passing through a stage of human life. This is *anakephalaiosis*.

¹⁰*Christus Victor*, 1937.

evil age. A strong point for Aulen's view is his presentation of God as being both Reconciler and Reconciled, a view which is truly Pauline, "—God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself—."

The Satisfaction Theory

This view comes from the Latin Medieval idea of feudalism and chivalry, where the honor of the feudal lord had to be upheld. By this view the atonement of Christ is satisfaction paid to God's honor which was violated through man's sin. Sin is a personal affront and dishonor to God. This dishonor cannot be overlooked and can be vindicated only by either "satisfaction" or "punishment." Punishment would annihilate man and defeat God's purpose; therefore satisfaction is the answer. Satisfaction, however, can come only from One who is both God and man, Jesus Christ. The classic formulation has come from Anselm (1033-1109) in his *Cur Deus Homo?*, published in 1098. He was Archbishop of Canterbury.

Anselm's strong arguments are briefly: (1) that God takes man's sin seriously, and it must be accounted for. Anselm had seen the weakness of the Ransom theory, i. e., the blood of Christ as a sort of trap for the devil. The Ransom theory failed to reckon with man's guilt. (2) Satisfaction is necessary for man's sin, and this satisfaction lies with God himself. Anselm insists on a divine interest; man cannot atone for his own guilt. Sin is a disruption of the moral order of God, and in this disruption Divinity has a stake. (3) Forgiveness from God is a result of Christ's work. God's grace and Christ's work are the same thing.

Anselm's critics replied: (1) that Anselm added fuel to the Roman Catholic doctrine of salvation-by-merit with the argument that Christ's death was "super-abundant"; and the surplus could be transferred to others. The "surplus" of merit was the amount beyond that which God required for satisfaction. For this reason the theory of Anselm has been justly called the "commercial theory," because of the arithmetic debit and credit, against and for man's account. (2) that Anselm failed to relate the work of Christ to its source in the love of God. In Anselm atonement is a part of the proper activity of God. Luther¹¹ pointed out that the proper activity of God is love, and he sees atonement as outside God's "normal" activity. This is almost a dualism, a loving Christ and a hateful God. Anselm almost does away with love of God in a metaphysical, logical way. (3) Anselm treats Christ's death as almost a "thing"—not in terms of His life. Death is almost an "aside," instead of obedience to God's will. Christ's death is supererogation and not filled with the moral love of God. (4) This theory pictures God as a type of feudal lord punishing unjust serfs. Instead God is a Supreme Being who requires moral order and righteousness because He Him-

¹¹This seems to be the view of Luther (and not the Latin view). Luther's view on Atonement is tied to his view on Justification, which is tied to the Incarnation. It is a dualism.

self is Morality and Righteousness. A sin of morality is an affront to God's person and to Jesus Christ.

The Penal-Substitution Theory

Just as the Patristic age was dominated by the captivity-ransom theory of atonement and the Medieval period dominated by a feudalistic "satisfaction" theory, so the post-Reformation period is dominated by a legal-jurisprudence theory or commonly called the "Penal-Substitution" theory. This age was full of ideas of laws and punishment. By the Penal-Substitution theory, Jesus vicariously takes man's penalty upon Himself and suffers for man. The guilt of the sinner is imputed to Christ, and the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the sinner. It is satisfaction through punishment.

This view was formulated and spread through the influence of Augustine, then Luther and Calvin. It has held sway in Protestant theology ever since. Calvin speaks of Christ as "bearing in His soul the torments of a condemned and lost man."¹² Neither Luther nor Calvin suggests, however, that God was angry with Christ. The theory of penal-substitution found its classic treatment in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. VIII, Section V: "The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him."¹³

The greatest weakness of this view of the Atonement is that it fails to distinguish between vicarious suffering and vicarious punishment. That Christ suffered for our guilt is Biblical; that he had sin "transferred" or "imputed" to him is certainly questionable. Sin can result only from transgression against God, and Jesus Christ never transgressed. The love which identified Jesus with sinners' suffering never identified itself with guilt. Such a thought is ethically untenable. This concept holds God the Father as a legal-minded, angry judge on the one hand and God the Son as an innocent, loving substitutionary sacrifice on the other. There is no such difference between Father and Son as this. The concept is widely held and defended today, however, by no less able advocate than Emil Brunner.

The Vicarious Repentance Theory

This is the theory of John McLeod Campbell and, later, of R. C. Moberly of Oxford. In a deeper-than-metaphysical sense of human nature taken by the Divine, Campbell points out that Christ makes adequate confession and repentance for sinners through both the Incarnation and Atonement, i. e., the latter can be understood only in terms of the former.

¹²*Institutes*, II, XVI, 10.

¹³Eph. 1:11, 14; John 17:2; Ro. 5:10; Heb. 9:12, 15.
man's behalf; yet Christ himself was sinless. This comes close to

Campbell argued that man himself cannot make adequate repentance or receive adequate punishment for sin, but Jesus does this through becoming flesh. Sin has disabled man from any ability to make adequate confession of it, but Christ confesses for man and in the heart of Atonement.

The Subjective Atonement Theory

The foregoing four summaries are of "objective" types of atonement, describing the effects of Christ's saving power from God to man. There is another "subjective" idea, however, which has its strong position in emphasizing man's part in Soteriology. It is the concept of Peter Abelard (1079-1142), a contemporary and critic of Anselm. According to Abelard, atonement is possible only by removing man's distrust and sin, for it is in man that sin has come. This change of heart on man's part is atonement and is accomplished through the love of Christ on the Cross. Instead of being primarily from God to man, Abelard has atonement from man to God (subjectively). This idea is set forth also in the theology of Schleiermacher ("perfect God-consciousness") and in the United States by Horace Bushnell, Rauschenbusch, and Harry Emerson Fosdick.

One can see the merit of this concept in emphasizing the conversion of the heart of man to bring about works worthy of repentance, something which holds a "back seat" in the objective theories where all atonement is from God's side. The charge is well founded that the latter touch on a commercial view and demand nothing of man.

On the other hand, viewed subjectively one might go to the extreme of Schleiermacher (and Fosdick?¹⁴) in thinking of salvation wholly or largely as a reorganization of man's attitudes—with individual sin and resultant condemnation virtually left out of the picture. This is the reason that most theologians regard salvation as essentially objective.

The difficulty of definition has already been mentioned. Any conclusion must take into account the seriousness of sin and the divine act of God in accomplishing salvation from it.

Anselm pointed out clearly that God takes sin seriously. This fact alone, when considered, demands divine action in regard to sin. No man can believe the Atonement in its deepest and most awful consequences who has little regard for the seriousness of sin.¹⁵

The Eighth Century B. C. prophets pound home to their Jewish brethren the inner character of sin and its results; these prophets greater and more elaborate sacrificial cults; men wanted forgiveness. The rigidity of sacrifice was never more stern and elaborate than in the days following Babylon and in the time of Christ. But

¹⁴This is not to say that Fosdick does not regard sin as serious; but he pays little attention to the consequences of sin in eschatology. Schleiermacher himself hardly mentions sin.

¹⁵e. g., the Freudians.

the theme of redemption in the great prophets and with Jesus of demand repentance and the heart's return to God.¹⁶ This led to Nazareth, never emphasized by the priests or pharisees, is based on what God has first done for man (objective).

Jesus too demanded repentance and much more. With Jesus repentance is more stern because God himself came seeking the transgressor. He walked the highways and byways begging men to repent and weeping when they would not. He wept not for himself but for sinners. Christ's attitude toward sinners does more to explain the atonement than any mere forensic phrases about "the will of God." To be sure His death was God's will—but viewed from the desperate plight of sinful man, a plight which no one but Jesus Christ understood.

At the Cross the early church saw the working of demonic powers—but she also saw the working of the providence of God. If the Cross had been merely the work of evil powers, instead of the will of God, the church would also have seen the Resurrection as mere triumph over evil. But it is much more; it is the means of reconciliation with God, a means which God himself has provided; not propitiation but expiation. Expiation is the better translation of the word *hilasmos* (e. g. 1 John 2:2). Propitiation has only to do with anger. As has been stated earlier, anger has to do with appeasement, and this is foreign to the New Testament. Wrath is the result of man's refusal of God's love, a love which makes God the victim. How this takes place we do not know.¹⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aulen, Gustaf: *Christus Victor*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1937.
- Baillie, D. M.: *God Was in Christ*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948. A classic.
- Burrows, Millar: *Outline of Biblical Theology*. New York: Filson, F. V. *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- Forsyth, P. T.: *Cruciality of the Cross*. London: Independent Press, 1955.
- Shaw, J. M.: *Christian Doctrine*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert: *New Testament Theology*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955.

¹⁶e. g., the Book of Amos, which like the Sermon on the Mount is a heavy treatment of ethics.

¹⁷See D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ*, p. 188.

A Note On 1 Cor. 12:13

J. W. McGarvey

(Editor's Note: The following article is a condensation prepared by R. L. Roberts, Jr., of a longer article by McGarvey in *Lard's Quarterly*, Vol. 1 (1865), pp. 428-442, entitled "Immersion in the Holy Spirit.")

The Correct Rendering of the Verse

"For by one Spirit were we all immersed into one body,—and were all made to drink of one Spirit." It is not "in one Spirit were we all immersed into one body," nor is it "we were all immersed in one Spirit into one body." Neither of these renderings expresses the meaning correctly and the latter contains a wrong collocation of the words.

Meaning of "En Heni Pneumati"

The word *en* means "in," and must be so rendered when there is nothing to rule otherwise. "*en heni pneumati*," standing alone, should be rendered "in one Spirit." But "*en*" is sometimes rendered "by," and must be so, when either the context, or the harmony of Scripture statement requires it.

There are three forms in which the agency of the Holy Spirit is expressed by "*pneuma*" in conjunction with a preposition.

1. *dia* with the genitive.
2. *hupo* with the ablative.
3. *en* with the locative.

Of these three, all of which are rendered "by" or "through" the Spirit, the last occurs *most frequently*. So the expression "*en heni Pneumati*" is the Greek form most frequently rendered "by the Spirit," and is used in declaring that something is done by the Spirit as an agent or actor. There are four occurrences of this usage in this chapter 12 which contains the text under discussion, and in the immediate context.

1. Verse 3, "No man speaking '*en pneumati Theou*' (by the Spirit of God), calls Jesus accursed; and no man is able to say that Jesus is the Lord, but '*in pneumati hagio*' (by the Holy Spirit)." In neither of these cases can we render it "in" the Spirit because it is evidently the purpose of the writer to express an agency of the Spirit; and because men can say that Jesus is Lord "by" the Spirit, though they be not themselves "in" the Spirit. It was "by" the Spirit as the source of all evidence, and not "in" the Spirit, that men were able to believe in and acknowledge the Lordship of Jesus; and when a man called Jesus accursed, it was proof not merely that he was not "in" the Spirit, but that he did not speak "by" the light which the Spirit afforded through his divine testimony.
2. Verse 9, "To another is given faith '*en to auto pneumati*' (by the same Spirit); to another the gift of healing '*en to auto pneumati*' (by the same Spirit)." The apostle here affirms that these gifts were conferred "by" the Spirit.

3. In the ten verses of this chapter, 3-13, there are twelve things said to be done "by" the Spirit, and "*en pneumati*" is the prevailing expression, only varied for the sake of euphony by "*dia pneumatos*" once, "*Kata pneuma*" once, and leaving "*en pneumati*" to be understood throughout the tenth verse.

"Hupo Pneumatos" and "En Pneumati" Used Interchangeably

The two forms "*hupo pneumatos*" and "*en pneumati*," are used in the same sense by Matthew and Luke in describing the same event. Each says that Jesus was "led by the Spirit into the wilderness" (Matt. 4:1; Luke 4:1), Matthew using the former expression, and Luke the latter.

Peter and Paul do the same thing. In declaring that the prophets of old spake "as they were moved 'by' the Holy Spirit," Peter uses "*hupo*" with the ablative; while Paul, in speaking of the mystery which was not made known to other generations, "as it was revealed to his holy apostles and prophets 'by the Spirit,'" uses "*en*" with the locative. (Comp. 2 Pet. 1:21 with Eph. 3:5.) In view of all this evidence, we hold it undeniable that the expression "*en pneumati*" is frequently used by the apostles in expressing what is done "by" the Spirit, and that it may be rendered "by the Spirit" wherever it is more suitable to the context, or to the nature of the subject under discussion in a particular passage.

It may now be affirmed that we have established three propositions:

1. That to render the passage in question, "we were all immersed 'in' one Spirit into one body," would be a mislocation of the apostle's words, and untrue in fact.
2. That it would be equally untrue to render it, "'in' one Spirit we were all immersed into one body"; meaning thereby, that we were first in the Spirit, and afterwards immersed into the body.
3. That the passage may be rendered, so far as grammatical propriety is concerned, "'by' one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." This last rendering being entirely consistent with the New Testament usage, and the only alternative if the first two are rejected.

1 Corinthians 6:11

1 Cor. 6:11 presents a striking parallel to the one under discussion. "You were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and '*en pneumati*' (by the Spirit) of our God." Now, they were not washed in the Spirit, neither were they sanctified or justified "in" the Spirit of God. But these were all done "by" the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus. Neither of them, however, was done "directly" by the Spirit. The act of justifying is the prerogative of the Father; and the Spirit can be said to justify only as he leads us to comply with the conditions of justification. Sanctification is the work of the Spirit, but it is accomplished "through the truth." As for the washing here mentioned, it evidently refers to the effect of baptism, in which they washed away their "sins calling on the name of the Lord." In what sense had this been

done "by the Spirit of our God?" Evidently, in the same sense in which Paul says in the same Epistle that "by one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." It was done, in one sense, by Paul, and Timothy, and Apollos; for they had been immersed by these men. But in still another sense, it was done by the Holy Spirit; for he both directed the administrator in commanding and performing the immersion, and also influenced the subject to submit to it. By the Holy Spirit, therefore, strictly and properly, the Corinthians had been "washed," and by the same Spirit, in the same act, they were immersed into one body.

"—and Were All Made To Drink of One Spirit"

That the interpretation of the passage which we have now given is the correct one is confirmed by evidence in the passage itself. That the last clause of the verse, "and were all made to drink into one Spirit," refers to the reception of the Holy Spirit is indisputable. The term "drink" certainly expresses the idea of receiving within us what is drunk; and when used of the Holy Spirit refers to the reception of the Spirit within us. If we are right in understanding the last clause of the sentence; we are right in our understanding of the first clause. The reception of the Spirit is the fact affirmed in the last clause, and it is presented as something additional to what was said in the first; but if the reception of the Spirit is declared in the first, the last is not an additional fact, but a repetition.

Conclusion

We conclude, therefore, that the first clause does not refer to the reception of the Spirit at all. On the contrary, it declares that it was by the Holy Spirit that we were induced to be immersed and become one body; while the last clause declares the additional fact that we all then became partakers of the refreshing influence of the Spirit as a guest within us.

BOOK NOTICES

Louis Berkhof, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1957) 169 pp. \$2.95.

With the advancement of liberalism the science of Biblical hermeneutics declined. The interest in a correct interpretation of the Bible has accompanied the renewed interest in conservative theology. Professor Berkhof, noted theologian and President Emeritus of Calvin Seminary, sets forth some valid principles of interpretation involving the grammatical, historical, and theological approaches. Included is a comprehensive history of hermeneutics from the Jews to the present time. The book is primarily designed for classes in seminaries and colleges, being written in an expanded outline form. It contains questions at the end of each section and very helpful references to related material in other literature. An eloquent testimony to the book's usefulness is the fact that this is its third printing.

Pat Harrell

Archibald McLean, *Alexander Campbell as a Preacher*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1955) 46 pp. \$1.00.

Alexander Campbell's competence as a preacher is well known by students of the Restoration Movement. Unfortunately, only a few of his sermons are extant. Mr. McLean surveys the scanty material along with the testimony of those who heard Campbell in the pulpit. The author analyzes his sermonic style, pulpit technique, and attitude toward preaching. Especially interesting are the numerous tributes paid to Campbell as a preacher by famous contemporaries. This short study, originally published in 1908, will be of interest to those who wish to see the Sage of Bethany in still another dimension.

Pat Harrell

J. B. Lightfoot (Translator), *The Apostolic Fathers*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1956) 288 pp. \$3.95.

Eusebius Pamphilus, *Ecclesiastical History*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1955) 480 pp. \$3.95.

The two volumes basic to an understanding of the early church are *The Apostolic Fathers* and Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. Both of these have been reprinted by Baker in popular editions designed for the average reader. The first is edited by J. B. Lightfoot, a leading authority, and contains introductory material to each book. The latter is a very readable translation by C. F. Cruse. In addition to the text, it contains a short life of Eusebius and a longer interpretation of the Council of Nice along with selected documents from that gathering. Every Christian should have a knowledge of these volumes for they reflect the processes by which the New Testament church was modified. Church History is not to be considered as the authority in the court of faith—the position of Judge belongs only to Scripture, but these documents are at least witnesses and their testimony should be heard.

Pat Harrell